

PA  
Part B

FFY2013  
State Performance Plan /  
Annual Performance Report

**Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)****General Supervision System:**

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

***School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)***

In 2013-14, there were approximately 1.7 million students enrolled in Pennsylvania's public schools, with 15.4% of these students receiving special education. The state has 500 school districts and approximately 176 charter schools; these entities serve as the responsible Local Education Agency (LEA) for the provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) to students with disabilities. In accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Chapter 14 of the State Board Regulations, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) provides general supervision of all public schools, school districts, and other public education agencies within the state to ensure that each student with a disability receives a FAPE and that each family has the benefits of a system of procedural safeguards.

Pennsylvania fulfills its general supervision requirements for comprehensive, effective monitoring and dispute resolution, including timely identification and correction of noncompliance in a number of ways, as described below.

**Monitoring**

PDE's Bureau of Special Education (BSE) focuses significant personnel and resources on monitoring LEA compliance and outcomes. All systems for monitoring and dispute resolution are web-based, and therefore conducive to cross-system data analysis and tracking of timelines. The BSE monitors all school districts and charter schools on a six-year cycle. County prisons and detention facilities, as well as other facilities where children are placed by a public entity, e.g., residential treatment facilities and private residential rehabilitation institutions, are also monitored on a six-year cycle. State juvenile facilities and state correctional institutions are monitored on a three-year cycle.

In addition to cyclical monitoring, the BSE also conducts focused monitoring. Topical areas for focused monitoring are selected based on data reported in Pennsylvania's State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and recommendations from the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and other stakeholder groups. Target monitoring of any LEA may also occur at BSE discretion when information from any source, including complaint or other dispute resolution data, suggests a pattern or systemic concern that warrants review.

In FFY 2013, the BSE conducted on-site cyclical monitoring of 118 school districts, 41 charter schools, 21 correctional facilities, and three private residential rehabilitation institutions, partial hospitalization programs and residential treatment facilities. Secondary transition focused monitoring was conducted in 10 LEAs. The BSE also conducted several SPP/APR on-site follow-up reviews, which occur when analysis of 618 or other SPP/APR data indicates potential noncompliance. A description of how BSE identifies and corrects noncompliance for specific SPP/APR indicators is included within each of those indicator sections of this report.

When findings of noncompliance are issued to an LEA through these web-based monitoring systems, the LEA is informed of the regulation that is being violated (linked to federal and state regulations) and must develop a Corrective Action Verification Plan (CAVP) that is approved by the BSE. The CAVP is systemically linked to technical assistance resources through the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN) and Intermediate Unit (IU) systems (see description in Technical Assistance Section below). The CAVP requires correction of policies, procedures and practices to ensure systemic correction, and includes specific required corrective action/evidence of change, timelines and resources, and tracking of timelines to closure. The BSE monitors implementation of the CAVP primarily through on-site visits that include review of revised policies and procedures, and correction of practices as evidenced by updated data

in a representative sample of student files. All corrective action must be completed within one year of notification of a finding of noncompliance. Because the system is web-based, BSE is able to effectively track progress in closing the CAVP and can capture real-time data about the status of corrective action. The CAVP is monitored until all corrective action has been completed.

In accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the BSE's procedures require systemic correction of policies, procedures and practices, as well as verification of correction through file reviews. Updated data must demonstrate 100% compliance with regulatory requirements prior to closure of corrective action. The BSE also requires student-specific corrective action for all citations of noncompliance where corrective action can be implemented. This is done through the Individual Corrective Action Plan (ICAP) component of the overall CAVP web-based system. In the ICAP, the BSE reviews updated data for each student whose file included a finding of noncompliance to ensure correction (unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA); additionally, BSE reviews a new sample of student files to verify compliance.

As reported to OSEP in prior APRs, the BSE has achieved between 99% and 100% compliance for timely correction of noncompliance for the past several years; this high level of compliance was also achieved during the FFY 2013 reporting period. Should any LEA fail to correct noncompliance as required, BSE has clearly defined enforcement procedures, as described in the Basic Education Circular titled *Special Education Compliance*.

The BSE's monitoring system is aligned with OSEP's new Results Driven Accountability (RDA) in several ways. Although a major focus of the state's current cyclical monitoring continues to be ensuring compliance with federal and state regulatory requirements, BSE's system also reviews outcome data such as graduation/dropout and participation in statewide assessments for students with disabilities. Since 2010-11, BSE's monitoring has also included an Educational Benefit Review, through which the LEA and BSE determine if students are progressing and deriving benefit from their educational programs. Focused monitoring also incorporates review of both compliance and performance outcomes.

### **Dispute Resolution**

The IDEA requires states to establish systems for state complaints, mediation, resolution processes, and due process complaints. Pennsylvania fulfills its general supervision requirements for these systems as described below. Data documenting the state's compliance with these requirements are collected by the state and reported annually to OSEP.

### ***State Complaints***

The BSE has effective procedures for investigating and resolving complaints filed under the IDEA and corresponding federal and state law and regulations. It is the responsibility of the BSE to resolve all complaints that meet the requirements of 34 CFR §300.153 and are filed with the BSE in accordance with these requirements. In the event that noncompliance is determined through a complaint investigation, the BSE monitors to ensure correction, including provision of technical assistance where needed. The BSE ensures correction of systemic and student specific noncompliance identified through the complaint system.

### ***Mediation***

The IDEA requires each state to offer mediation services to parents and educational agencies. The Office for Dispute Resolution (ODR) contracts with highly trained, independent mediators to provide mediation services. In Pennsylvania, the vast majority of mediations result in agreements between the parties.

### ***Due Process Complaints***

The IDEA also requires that each state have an effective system for managing due process complaints. The ODR uses a cadre of highly trained, independent hearing officers to conduct hearings in accordance with federal requirements. In Pennsylvania, greater than 90% of such complaints settle prior to full adjudication.

Pennsylvania has procedures in place to review, identify and correct child-specific noncompliance identified in a hearing officer's decision, as well as correction of any policies/practices/procedures that may affect other students with disabilities within the LEA.

### ***Resolution Process***

IDEA 2004 introduced the resolution meeting process as an additional opportunity for parties to resolve disputes. The purpose of the resolution meeting is for the parent to discuss a due process complaint and the facts that form the basis of the complaint so that the LEA has an opportunity to resolve the dispute. Strict timelines apply to the process. The ODR oversees timely implementation of the resolution meeting process. Any compliance concerns related to the resolution process are addressed by the BSE.

### ***Additional dispute resolution options***

While not required by federal regulations, the ODR provides additional resources and systems for parents and LEAs to resolve educational disputes involving students with disabilities. The ODR Stakeholder Council brings together representatives from a broad array of stakeholders to provide input and recommendations regarding the special education dispute resolution system.

The Evaluative Conciliation Conference, or "ECC," is the newest service offered by ODR. Due process hearings are an important procedural safeguard for parents; however, most special education disputes settle without the need for a fully-adjudicated due process hearing. Many of these cases benefit from the assistance of someone knowledgeable and impartial to offer an informed opinion toward reaching agreement. This is the basic concept of ECC.

The Special Education ConsultLine is a toll-free information helpline for parents and advocates who have questions or concerns about special education for school-age children. ConsultLine is staffed by specialists who provide information about special education and regulatory requirements. ConsultLine specialists may be reached by voice or text telephone devices for the deaf (TTY). Interpreter services are available for non-English speaking callers. In FFY 2013 ConsultLine provided service to over 2,800 constituents.

ConsultLine's Call Resolution Process (CRP) is an effective dispute resolution tool for compliance-related concerns. During CRP, the call specialist acts as a conduit of information between the parent and the school; the specialist does not serve as an advocate, decision-maker, mediator, or compliance adviser.

IEP Facilitation has been offered by ODR for more than a decade, long before most states developed such a program. Facilitation services are available to parents and educators when developing the IEP. Because facilitation is a voluntary process, both the parent and LEA must agree to the presence of a facilitator.

Pennsylvania's recognition as an "exemplar state" by OSEP and the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) is an acknowledgement of the array of quality dispute resolution services offered by ODR.

### ***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

Pennsylvania's oversight and general supervision of local programs occurs on an on-going basis. Each preschool early intervention program participates in a verification visit every four years. There are seven areas reviewed during the verification visit. In each of the seven areas, there are a number of required indicators that cover compliance, program management and results items that focus on improving outcomes for children and families. Verification visits include the following activities: data reviews, review of policies, individual child record reviews and observations of service delivery. Verification teams are utilized during these on-site visits and include state Bureau of Early Intervention Services (BEIS) staff, Early Intervention Technical Assistance (EITA) staff, and peer reviewers. The utilization of verification teams allows BEIS to increase or decrease the number of staff conducting verification visits based on the performance

level of the local early intervention program, which improves inter-rater reliability. Following the verification visits, local programs develop quality enhancement plans that focus on the correction of noncompliance, as well as activities to enhance program quality to improve outcomes for children and families. Validation of any noncompliance identified during the verification visit is conducted each year by BEIS staff to ensure that all areas of noncompliance are corrected within a year.

During the years a verification visit does not take place, local programs participate in a self-verification process. The self-verification process includes: the analysis of local data, and updates on program management activities, result goals and targets, and activities to maintain program compliance. Following the results of the self-verification process, local programs update their quality enhancements plans to reflect new activities needed to address compliance issues and enhancements to program quality initiatives. Validation of any noncompliances identified during the self-verification review are conducted each year by BEIS staff to ensure all areas of noncompliance are corrected within a year.

The results of both the verification and self-verification visits are used to assist BEIS in making local program determinations that are issued on an annual basis. The verification process is also designed to provide differentiated levels of support to local programs, depending on the determinations issued. This allows the BEIS to use resources in a more effective and efficient manner and have the greatest impact on program practices.

Additional on-site visits from BEIS staff may occur at the discretion of BEIS staff if during the verification cycle there is a significant decrease in program performance or individual or systematic concerns arise.

The BEIS also uses a comprehensive data management system that enables the review of individual child data as well as statewide data. The data management system supports referral information, service coordination activities, planning information, financial management, quality measures and other reporting needs for the BEIS. This information system generates documents (Evaluation and Plan Documents) and the information contained in these documents is used to create reports to manage the program. Rigorous analysis of the data by staff on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis allows BEIS to ensure data driven decision making for quality improvement.

Pennsylvania also ensures that a complaint management process is implemented. BEIS staff reviews data from complaint investigations, mediations and due process hearings to improve the EI system. Trends are analyzed, training needs are identified and improvement strategies are implemented.

In addition, each preschool early intervention program is assigned a BEIS advisor. The BEIS advisor serves as a primary contact to each preschool early intervention program and is responsible for addressing budget issues, compliance issues, complaint issues, policy and procedural requirements and overall program performance. As a result of this involvement with local programs, each BEIS advisor has on-going contact with each of his/her local programs. These contacts occur throughout the year during verification visits, validation visits, training and technical assistance visits, complaint investigations, biannual leadership meetings and local regional meetings. This attention to local programs: 1) allows all BEIS staff, advisors and statewide management staff to be aware of program concerns and issues, 2) provides BEIS with the ability to fulfill requirements for a comprehensive and effective general supervision system that identifies and addresses issues of noncompliance, 3) ensures the correction of noncompliance within one year and 4) allows for the implementation of improvement strategies and enforcement strategies in a timely manner.

#### **Technical Assistance System:**

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

#### ***School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)***

The PaTTAN is designed to support the efforts and initiatives of the PDE and BSE, and build capacity of IUs and LEAs to serve students receiving special education services. PaTTAN provides a continuum of high quality technical assistance that is designed to help LEAs improve student outcomes. PaTTAN provides

support to schools, parents, educators, students and administrators via multiple statewide initiatives. There are three PaTTAN locations, one each in the eastern (PaTTAN-King of Prussia), central (PaTTAN-Harrisburg), and western (PaTTAN-Pittsburgh) areas of the state.

The majority of technical assistance provided is tied directly to federal regulatory requirements. In addition to the three PaTTAN offices, the BSE also funds five full-time Training and Consultation (TaCs) positions within each of the state's 29 IUs. The roles of the PaTTAN and IU TaCs fulfill consultation and technical assistance federal requirements. In addition, because Pennsylvania has established regional PaTTAN offices, training and technical assistance is localized and highly customized through ongoing collaboration between PaTTAN and IU consultants and LEAs. This model helps the PDE positively influence the quality of technical assistance services and professional development provided for each LEA, and ensures that processes are in place to systematically collect outcome data, consistent with state and federal reporting requirements.

The role of the PaTTAN consultants and the IU TaCs is based on collaboration, since IU TaCs are the first resource available to LEAs. If an LEA is in need of technical assistance, it first contacts the local IU for support. The system is designed to ensure that IU and PaTTAN consultants will "pool" their expertise in order to meet the needs of LEAs in an effective and efficient manner. In some instances, the PaTTAN staff will work directly with the LEA if it is determined this is the most effective and efficient way to assist a given school.

Under IDEA, there are two major components that the BSE relies on PaTTAN offices to provide information and resources around technical assistance. The first component is the IDEA grant application. The federal government has identified priority areas for professional development and federal reporting, including secondary transition, low incidence disabilities, assistive technology, literacy, statewide assessments, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and behavior. BSE reports annually to the federal government indicating the resources that will be allocated for each of these initiatives. PaTTAN assists with data collection and outcome analyses associated with each initiative and in partnership with IUs as per grant requirements.

The second component related to professional development and technical assistance is in reference to SPP/APR indicators and BSE reporting requirements. PaTTAN and IU consultants are responsible for providing documentation of training and technical assistance activities in order to determine the impact that services are having on outcomes of students with disabilities.

The PaTTAN offices and IU TaCs also work collaboratively in other activities, such as providing technical assistance and professional development needed by LEAs as the result of state monitoring. If LEAs are found to be out of compliance, consultants work together to assist the LEA with customized support. LEAs may also contact PDE directly with training and technical assistance requests.

The BSE, through Pennsylvania's multi-layered statewide system of training and technical assistance, has demonstrated a consistently positive impact and associated outcomes for students with disabilities. The current technical assistance system has the personnel needed to effectively support the SPP/APR. In addition, the system has the advantage of working in collaboration with multiple stakeholders such as the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), multiple bureaus within the PDE (e.g., Title I, Title III, Corrections, Migrant Education, Career and Technical Education) and other state and national agencies to support effective practices that have resulted in positive outcomes for students with disabilities.

Pennsylvania's Statewide System of Support (PaTTAN and IU TaCs) serves as both: (1) Pennsylvania's Technical Assistance System, and (2) Pennsylvania's Professional Development System. The technical assistance provided by the PaTTAN and IU TaCs is based upon current research and best practice in the field. Data are collected before, during, and after the implementation and delivery of technical assistance to ensure that the technical assistance is directly benefiting students with disabilities. The technical assistance provided by Pennsylvania's Statewide System of Support is aligned with the principles of OSEP's RDA.

Each year, statewide training and technical assistance plans associated with each broad initiative are informed by data and outcomes, LEA needs and stakeholder input. Stakeholders include LEAs, IUs, national organizations, Parent Training and Information (PTI) centers, Community Parent Resource Centers (CPRCs), SEAP, parents, students with disabilities and other agencies. Collaboration continues to be one of the most important mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of technical assistance.

Pennsylvania's Statewide System of Support is designed to provide a continuum of timely technical assistance to LEAs, including:

- *Educational Consultants:* PaTTAN has professional staff with expertise in every aspect of special education, such as autism, behavior, reading, math, speech, school psychology, regulations, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and Assistive Technology. These staff are available to provide technical assistance in multiple ways, including presentations at statewide conferences, direct TA to LEAs, buildings, classrooms, teams working with students with disabilities and one-on-one guided practice.
- *Summer Institutes:* Statewide conferences, including institutes and forums, are offered each year for all stakeholders, including families, educators, students and others. Examples include: Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Forum, National Autism Conference, Secondary Transition Conference, Special Education Leadership Summer Academy, PA Deaf-Blind Project Family Learning Conference, Summer Academy for Students with Vision Impairments and Blindness and the Low Incidence Institute.
- *Onsite Guided Practice Technical Assistance:* On-site implementation support that includes intensive coaching and mentoring is routinely included as part of technical assistance. Data is collected before, during and after the technical assistance to ensure improved students outcomes.
- *Collaboration with other agencies and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE):* Pennsylvania's Statewide System of Support works in collaboration with agencies and multiple IHEs to ensure timely delivery of high quality evidenced based technical assistance and supports to LEAs. In addition to helping the system design the technical assistance, agencies and IHE personnel also participate in training opportunities (e.g., Penn State University partnering for the National Autism Conference, research analyses with Lehigh University's Center for Research to Practice).
- *Webinars and face-to-face training sessions:* PaTTAN offers webinars and on-site training and technical assistance to interested stakeholders. Webinars are closed-captioned and are posted on the PaTTAN website within a 1-2 week period.
- *Federal and state regulations:* PaTTAN offers multiple technical assistance opportunities throughout the year to support the implementation of federal and state regulations and special education procedural safeguards.
- *Website resources:* PaTTAN maintains a robust website ([www.pattan.net](http://www.pattan.net)) featuring training opportunities, resources, and publications that address relevant topics, and provides access to other educational partners supporting student learning and achievement.

The following are examples of statewide initiatives that Pennsylvania has in place to ensure timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs:

- Autism Initiative
- Behavior Initiative
- Blind-Visual Impairment Initiative

- Deaf-Blind Initiative
- Early Intervention Initiative
- Family Engagement Initiative
- Inclusive Practices Initiative
- Intensive Interagency Initiative
- Mathematics Initiative
- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support Initiative
- Paraprofessionals Initiative
- Reading Initiative
- School Psychology Initiative
- Secondary Transition Initiative
- Special Education Leadership Initiative
- Speech and Language Initiative
- Students with Complex Needs Initiative, and
- Traumatic Brain Injury Initiative.

In addition, PaTTAN provides technical assistance to LEAs and support to students with disabilities through its Accessible Instructional Materials and Assistive Device Short-Term Loan programs. PaTTAN offers ongoing technical assistance opportunities for both programs in the form of workshops, guided practice, seminars, statewide conferences, distance learning, video conferences, and online courses. Many of the technical assistance opportunities have accompanying support materials to further explain the concepts addressed in training and to provide “take home” materials for learners.

In a typical year, PaTTAN provides over 1,800 technical assistance/professional development opportunities to over 130,000 individuals. This means that each day the PaTTAN system is providing approximately 14 technical assistance/professional development activities to over 1,000 individuals. Annually, PaTTAN also develops over 200 new or revised publications and disseminates them to more than 380,000 individuals.

### ***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

The Early Intervention Technical Assistance (EITA) system provides statewide training and technical assistance on behalf of the BEIS and the Pennsylvania Departments of Human Services and Education. The primary recipients of EITA training and technical assistance are the local infant/toddler and preschool early intervention programs that provide supports and services to children with developmental disabilities and their families. EITA is part of PaTTAN, which provides training and technical assistance for school age children and their families. EITA provides both statewide and regional training initiatives that are developed through the analysis of statewide data, including program verification visit and self-verification results, state and federal requirements, relevant research and planning with state department staff. Statewide professional development trainings are provided across the Commonwealth when it is necessary to ensure a consistent message from the BEIS. Family members are always included and welcomed participants and trainers in professional development activities. Examples of current statewide training initiatives include literacy, autism, positive behavior supports, inclusion, assistive technology and parent leadership.

EITA also provides assistance in the development of quality enhancement plans developed annually with each infant/toddler and preschool early intervention program. The quality enhancement plan is based on findings from verification visits with local programs, self-verifications completed by local programs, BEIS priorities, relevant research, and locally identified needs. The quality enhancement plan is linked to the SPP/APR. Quality enhancement planning is an ongoing process that is the result of conversations, data



collection and review, research and clear identification of outcomes. The quality enhancement plan focuses on specific programmatic changes or outcomes and includes information on how change will be measured. Quality enhancement plans focus on providing technical assistance and building local capacity through repeated contacts with the same persons/programs to assist with program wide change. The plan is a flexible document that is updated as additional information or needs arise.

#### **Professional Development System:**

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

#### **School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)**

The BSE, through Pennsylvania's Statewide System of Support, has demonstrated a consistently positive impact and associated outcomes for students with disabilities. The system has expertise in RDA, and has the personnel needed to effectively support the SPP/APR. (For additional information regarding the BSE, the PaTTAN offices and the IU TaCs, as well as how the data collected by PaTTAN and IU TaCs are tied to the BSE and used for federal reporting, please refer to the Technical Assistance section of this plan.)

Pennsylvania's Statewide System of Support serves as the state's technical assistance and professional development systems. The professional development for service providers delivered by PaTTAN and IU TaCs is based upon current research and best practice in the field. Each initiative is required to develop a multi-year plan aligned with the principles of OSEP's RDA, and must demonstrate how the professional development activities will equip service providers with the skills needed to effectively provide services to improve results for students with disabilities. Collaboration among the PaTTAN offices, the IU TaCs and stakeholders continues to be one of the most important mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency associated with professional development in Pennsylvania.

This support system is designed to provide a continuum of timely professional development opportunities to LEAs and other service providers. It provides a full array of training and professional development opportunities targeted to improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

Professional development includes, but is not limited to:

- *PA Standards Aligned System (SAS)*: SAS is a comprehensive school improvement framework that is comprised of six key elements that when implemented with fidelity have shown promise in helping schools improve outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities. Designed as a web-based portal and updated on an ongoing basis, the SAS gathers materials for each of the six elements and centralizes them in one location. The six elements are: Standards, Assessments, Curriculum Frameworks, Instruction, Materials and Resources, and Safe and Supportive Schools. More information about SAS is located at [www.pdesas.org](http://www.pdesas.org).
- *Pennsylvania Deaf-Blind Project*: This project provides targeted professional development to service providers, parents, and educators supporting infants, toddlers, and students with deaf-blindness. Educational consultants from all three PaTTAN offices and the EITA system provide targeted support to LEA teams. Two family consultants also deliver services and supports to service providers and families of students with deaf-blindness. The goals of the Project are to: (1) increase the knowledge and skills of early intervention providers related to deaf-blindness so that they can implement evidence-based best practices; (2) increase the skills and knowledge of school teams to improve secondary transition outcomes for youth who are deaf-blind; (3) create a multi-tiered system of support for families that provides information and helps network and connect family members; (4) increase the knowledge and skills of paraprofessionals related to deaf-blindness so that they can more effectively support the learning of students with deaf-blindness; and (5) create a network of Pennsylvania Deaf-Blind Liaisons who will serve as regional contacts for educators supporting children with deaf-blindness.

- *State Professional Development Grant (SPDG) Project MAX:* The goal of this project is to provide access for students with complex support needs to high-quality, standards-aligned and grade level instruction and intervention. Capacity-building occurs with interdisciplinary teams and service providers who receive coaching and technical assistance related to evidence-based methodologies, implementation feedback, standards-aligned instruction and assessment practices.
- *Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership Program (PIL):* This program ensures that school leaders receive timely and effective support through a multi-year, 4-course program delivered to cohorts of principals and other school leaders. Open to administrators at the building and central office levels, participants engage in professional reading, discussion, activities and projects throughout the year. They are expected to apply what they are learning within their roles and responsibilities. The PIL program includes specific components that address special education requirements.
- *Comprehensive Planning Tools:* Pennsylvania's regulations require a variety of plans, including plans for professional development, technology, and special education. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requirements for school improvement plans add to the mix of required "blueprints." In addition, Pennsylvania has a long history of district-level strategic planning. To facilitate deliberate, systemic approaches to improvement, PDE developed the Comprehensive Planning Tool, an online resource built on solid research, to support the process of identifying needs through root-cause analyses, developing strategies based on evidence-based practices and monitoring implementation efforts. Schools/districts are divided into three phases so that every LEA develops its plans on a manageable cycle, with support from IU staff specially trained in the use of the online tool. IUs also facilitate school improvement planning and review school improvement plans required under ESEA.
- *National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) Training:* For new principals and other administrators, the NISL offers high-quality, research-based professional development programs designed to give principals the critical knowledge and skills they need to become effective instructional leaders and improve student achievement in their schools. Researchers based the training of school principals on leadership training developed for business, the military, medicine and other fields to create a state-of-the-art executive education program for principals. The teaching materials build on the best learning strategies for adult professional education.
- *Training Opportunities:* PaTTAN provides a full array of professional development and technical assistance targeted to improving student results. This takes many forms in order to meet the varied needs of PaTTAN's constituents. Week-long summer institutes, ongoing professional development series, webinars, on-site assistance and individual student or teacher supports are some of the means by which PaTTAN provides services to schools.
- *Federal-State Regulations:* PaTTAN works closely with the BSE in developing the needed professional development and services for Pennsylvania to meet requirements under the IDEA and Chapter 14 of the Pennsylvania School Code. These supports include professional development linked to the SPP/APR indicators, development of compliant special education forms, the annual collection of student data and the monitoring system.
- *Assistive Technology and Accessible Instructional Materials:* PaTTAN maintains a short-term loan library that offers a broad array of assistive technology devices. These devices are borrowed by LEAs and are used to determine the appropriateness of a particular device for an individual student prior to purchasing the equipment. In addition, the PaTTAN Accessible Instructional Materials Center provides large print and Braille text materials to students who are blind or visually impaired. PaTTAN represents the PDE as the Ex-Officio Trustee with responsibility of managing and coordinating federal quota funds

with the American Printing House for the Blind (APH) for the purchase of text and educational supplies for students who are legally blind. PaTTAN also maintains an annual census of children from birth through 21 who are legally blind, and provides an annual report of eligible students to the APH.

- *Website Resources:* PaTTAN's website ([www.pattan.net](http://www.pattan.net)) features training opportunities, resources and publications that address relevant topics and provide access to other educational partners supporting student learning and achievement.

Ultimately, the focus of PaTTAN's work is on building the capacity of LEAs and services providers to promote effective instructional practices for students with disabilities. In order to do this, PaTTAN provides technical assistance and professional development that is framed by Pennsylvania's Standards Aligned System.

### ***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

Pennsylvania's professional development system through EITA focuses on a model that supports the BEIS in managing the early intervention system to ensure skilled, highly qualified early intervention staff that results in high quality services. The four core functions that are used to support the BEIS include:

- *Verification Support* - providing support to the BEIS's verification process to ensure high quality EI services.
  - Participation in infant toddler and preschool EI verification teams,
  - Training and technical assistance support to local programs based on verification needs and quality enhancement plans,
  - Targeted, intensive support to select programs based on the results of the verification process or program management data analysis.
- *Policy Support* - providing assistance to the BEIS in development of policies to ensure high quality EI services and assisting local programs in translating EI policies into practice. This is accomplished through:
  - Assistance in developing BEIS policy documents & reports,
  - Development of statewide leadership activities,
  - Policy related research & materials development.
- *Support for professional development in EI core competencies* - providing professional development to ensure that all EI staff have the basic competencies needed to provide high quality EI services to children and families. This is accomplished through:
  - Statewide and local workshops
  - Online learning modules & webinars
  - Materials development & dissemination
- *Professional development support for EI evidence based practices* – providing professional development activities to EI staff based on innovative evidence based practices, designed to enhance existing high quality EI services. This is accomplished through:
  - Statewide and local training
  - Online learning modules & webinars, and
  - Materials development & dissemination.

To support the four core functions of EITA, the following strategies and business practices are utilized:

- Build partnerships with state and local EI leadership;
- Provide support to families by actively working to build family leaders;
- Provide technical assistance that is informed by multiple forms of data;
- Use the most current learning technologies to effectively reach our audiences;
- Build partnerships with other early intervention and early childhood technical assistance agencies and organizations, such as connections to school-age training and technical assistance;
- Evaluate both the long and short term impact of our activities;
- Provide effective and efficient project management; and
- Provide solutions that are responsive to identified needs.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

#### ***School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)***

Pennsylvania has a long history of obtaining broad stakeholder input in the preparation of reports and responses to IDEA accountability requirements. The BSE has continuously collaborated with stakeholders regarding its SPP/APR. For development of the SPP/APR covering FFY 2013-2018, Pennsylvania again implemented a comprehensive process to gather stakeholder input. This process is described below.

In July 2014, an electronic mail message was sent through PennLink, the official PDE electronic communication system, announcing opportunities for stakeholder input to the SPP/APR. This message was distributed statewide to parents, advocacy groups, school districts, charter schools, IUs, approved private schools, preschool and infant/toddlers early intervention programs and other interested parties to invite participation in three stakeholder input sessions. These sessions were held in August in Harrisburg (central Pennsylvania), King of Prussia (eastern Pennsylvania), and Pittsburgh (western Pennsylvania). In addition to the broadly distributed PennLink, notices were posted on the state's special education listserv as well as the PaTTAN and PDE websites. A web-based system was also available to collect written input. To encourage maximum participation, two follow-up PennLink messages were distributed.

Approximately 120 individuals comprised of parents, advocates and educators, participated in the input sessions. At each session, a structured and facilitated process was followed to solicit input regarding measurable and rigorous targets and set priorities for improvement activities to reach the targets over six years. Participants viewed a welcoming video from the Director of the Bureau of Special Education that provided an overview of the SPP/APR, followed by a general presentation by PaTTAN staff describing the process to be followed for target setting. Participants then attended one of four self-selected groups for a facilitated discussion. These groups focused on specific indicators, with all groups also addressing Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

A session was held in July 2014 with the IU Directors of Special Education to provide information about the SPP/APR targets, and to specifically gain input from this highly informed group about setting targets, prioritizing improvement activities and exploring areas of focus for the SSIP.

At the Special Education Leadership Summer Academy in July 2014, a plenary session was dedicated to the SPP/APR and RDA. Participants engaged in discussions of targets, improvement activities and potential focus areas for the SSIP.

Throughout 2014, SEAP members reviewed selected SPP/APR indicators. BSE sought input on targets for results indicators. Supported by a professional facilitator, the SEAP provided input to structured questions regarding reasonable, yet rigorous targets for FFY 2013-2018 and suggested improvement activities.

At its May 2014 meeting, the SEAP recommended targets and improvement activities for Indicator 15 (resolution session outcomes), Indicator 16 (mediation outcomes) and Indicator 3B (participation in

statewide assessments).

At its September 2014 meeting, the SEAP recommended targets and improvement activities for Indicator 4A (suspension and expulsion rates) and Indicator 5 (educational settings for school age students).

At its November 2014 meeting, the SEAP recommended targets and improvement activities for Indicator 2 (percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school), Indicator 8 (school-facilitated parent involvement) and Indicator 14 (post school outcomes).

Data from all stakeholders were summarized and carefully considered by the BSE in establishing measurable and rigorous targets for this SPP/APR.

### ***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

Pennsylvania's Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the SEAP. Using these two groups allows BEIS to gather wide stakeholder input. The Committee for Cohesive Early Intervention (CCEI), a workgroup of the SICC, also focuses on the review of data, specifically data that impacts the coordination of the state's birth–5 EI system. BEIS presented its data and infrastructure analysis to the SICC, CCEI and SEAP, and gathered input on targets for the SPP/APR. Membership in the SICC and CCEI is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local EI program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, and a representative of Pennsylvania's homeless program.

The BEIS convenes monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, leadership conference in fall). Members of the EI leadership participated in public forums held by the BEIS to gather input on targets for the SPP.

In addition to our ongoing work with stakeholders, Pennsylvania's EI and school age programs jointly convened a series of stakeholder input sessions. Each of these sessions provided an opportunity to review data on SPP indicators. Approximately 120 stakeholders participated in the input sessions. Early intervention participants included local program leadership, service delivery staff, parents, advocacy groups and early childhood TA providers (Regional Keys).

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

### ***School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)***

Pennsylvania complies with all federal requirements for reporting to the public. The BSE publishes annual, online Special Education Data Reports that illustrate the performance of each LEA in meeting SPP/APR targets. Reporting on FFY 2012 LEA performance was completed in accordance with 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A). These reports are located at the following website: <http://penndata.hbg.psu.edu>.

The FFY 2012 SPP, including all revisions, is posted on the Pennsylvania Department of Education's website, <http://www.education.state.pa.us>, and the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network's (PaTTAN) website, <http://www.pattan.net>.

### ***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

Pennsylvania will continue to comply with all federal requirements for the annual reporting to the public. Data from the SPP/APR are available on a statewide level and for each preschool early intervention program. Pennsylvania's updated SPP/APR will be posted to the following websites:

- The Pennsylvania Department of Education Early Intervention OSEP Reporting webpage at [http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/early\\_intervention/8710/osep\\_reporting/590305](http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/early_intervention/8710/osep_reporting/590305) and the website of the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network at [www.pattan.net](http://www.pattan.net). The websites are the primary sources of statewide information on the early intervention program and are used by the early intervention community to obtain updates and new information.
- An announcement will be made about the availability of the updated SPP/APR on the BUILD list serve, an email listserv that reaches early childhood/early intervention advocates across the state.

The BEIS, in conjunction with the Pennsylvania State Data Center, developed a web-based dashboard that is used to disseminate updated APR data on OSEP indicators to the general public. The Dashboard currently includes FFY 2005 through FFY 2012 data for each preschool early intervention program and will be updated to include the FFY 2013 data after submission of the SPP/APR, but no later than 120 days from submission of the SPP/APR. Information can be found at [http://penndata.hbg.psu.edu/Preschool\\_EI\\_Program/index.aspx](http://penndata.hbg.psu.edu/Preschool_EI_Program/index.aspx).

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		92.65%	58.00%	88.00%	80.00%	82.50%	82.50%	85.00%
Data	91.79%	84.48%	86.52%	87.27%	84.30%	86.10%	71.02%	70.18%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania's SEAP has been briefed about the federal requirement to align ESEA and SPP/APR graduation data and targets. PDE establishes graduation targets, while SEAP continues to provide input to the BSE regarding improvement activities.

**Explanation of FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 target entries:** PDE's ESEA four-year adjusted cohort graduation goal is *NOT* 0%. Please see the attachment for this Indicator for the targets for this SPP/APR.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	15,030	17797
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	20,348	23,737
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	74.00%	Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Explanation of Alternate Data

EdFacts data from September 2014 was updated by PDE on December 10, 2014.

### Explanation of Data Discrepancy

Please explain why the calculated total does not match the adjusted cohort graduation rate reported to the CSPR.

EdFacts data from September 2014 was updated by PDE on December 10, 2014.

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
17,797	23,737	70.18%	0%	74.98%

**Graduation Conditions Field**

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

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

In 2013, Pennsylvania's State Board of Education approved new academic standards and revised high school graduation requirements, as set forth in Title 22, Chapter 4 Regulations. The regulations require that each school district, charter school, cyber charter school and area vocational-technical school (AVTS) (if the AVTS graduates students) adopt and implement requirements for high school graduation that, at a minimum, include course completion and grades and demonstration of proficiency or above in the state academic standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics, Science and Technology and Environment and Ecology, and in each of the state academic standards for which there is not a state assessment.

These regulations are applicable to all students and include an extensive multi-year implementation schedule. Additionally, they describe criteria for participation in the statewide system of assessment as a component of meeting graduation requirements.

The state's assessment system includes the PSSA (grades 3-8), the Keystone Exams, which are state-developed end-of-course assessments (high school), and the Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment, or PASA, (for students with significant cognitive disabilities). The PDE has also developed a project based assessment (PBA) system for students who are unable to demonstrate proficiency on a Keystone Exam. All students, including students with disabilities, must take the Keystone Exams no later than grade 11 (unless parentally excused due to religious conflict, or participating in the PASA). The requirements for the Keystone Exams and PBA are identical for students with disabilities and students without disabilities. However, a student with a disability can take the PBA after taking the Keystone Exams only once, if determined appropriate by their IEP team, while a general education student must attempt the Keystone Exams at least twice before taking the PBA.

Pennsylvania has no alternate high school diploma for students with disabilities. All students graduating receive a regular high school diploma.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**



None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's yearly target of 85% or a 10% reduction of the difference between the previous year's graduation rate and the 85% goal.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		6.65%	12.75%	11.33%	9.91%	8.50%	8.50%	8.50%
Data	7.36%	14.17%	12.16%	11.13%	11.10%	10.50%	10.90%	12.24%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	10.97%	10.97%	10.97%	10.97%	10.97%	9.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders reviewed Pennsylvania’s historical performance and target data as well as national trend data for this indicator and recommended that BSE adopt the targets shown above. A more detailed description of stakeholder input appears in the introduction to this document.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	17,923	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	72	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	309	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	2,263	null
SY 2012-13 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/5/2014	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	54	null

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
2,263	20,621	12.24%	10.97%	10.97%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Indicator Measurement Table requires a description of what constitutes dropping out in the state:

State Regulations, 22 PA Code, Chapter 12, establish Pennsylvania's compulsory school attendance age as 8-17. All students must attend school during this period of their lives. A dropout is a student who, for any reason other than death, leaves school before graduation without transferring to another school/institution.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								38.60%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	43.70%	48.80%	53.90%	59.00%	64.10%	69.20%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania's ESEA waiver established a methodology for calculating the Closing the Achievement Gap AMO. The targets displayed above are based on this approved methodology.

Pennsylvania's SEAP has been briefed about the federal requirement to align ESEA and SPP/APR assessment data and targets. PDE establishes AMOs, while SEAP continues to provide input to the BSE regarding improvement activities.

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

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

Yes  No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

AYP  AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
663	629	191	38.60%	43.70%	30.37%

#### Explanation of Slippage

A change in AMO calculation methods is a potential source of slippage on this indicator. In the FFY 2012 baseline year, LEA performance was compared to the state average to determine whether the AMO for the IEP subgroup was met. In FFY 2013, this was changed to the Closing the Achievement Gap calculation

approved in Pennsylvania's ESEA flexibility waiver. This method considers an AMO to be met if the cumulative achievement gap closure is occurring at a rate reflecting success in meeting the goal of closing one-half the gap between FFY 2012 performance and 100% proficiency over six years. Given this "apples to oranges" comparison, the designation of slippage for Indicator 3A as an artifact of the change in calculation methods may be misleading.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

### Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		95.25%	95.50%	95.70%	95.85%	96.00%	96.10%	96.20%
			Data	97.40%	97.30%	91.70%	98.30%	98.60%	98.60%	98.40%	98.00%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		95.25%	95.50%	95.70%	95.85%	96.00%	96.10%	96.20%
			Data	97.40%	97.60%	91.80%	98.80%	98.50%	98.70%	98.50%	98.20%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania's SEAP has been briefed about the federal requirement to align ESEA and SPP/APR assessment data and targets. Within PDE's approved ESEA waiver, the required rate for meeting the participation AMO has been established at 95%. PDE establishes AMOs, while SEAP continues to provide input to the BSE regarding improvement activities.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	21875	23207	23071	22519	23133	23253	n	n	20767	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7620	7155	6265	6662	7646	7849			9103		

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	11726	13421	14157	13196	12643	12594			7929		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2308	2335	2375	2390	2473	2343			1875		

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	21889	23207	23068	22521	23136	23258	n	n	20773	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7333	6855	6107	6464	7327	7808			8493		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12074	13769	14337	13441	13018	12695			8508		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2308	2335	2375	2390	2473	2343			1875		

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	157,825	154,065	98.00%	95.00%	97.62%

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	157,852	154,328	98.20%	95.00%	97.77%

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Public reports of assessment results conforming to 34 CFR §300.160(f) are located at <http://www.esaefedreport.com>, and assessment results by accommodation type with the unit of analysis as the state, LEA and the school are located at [http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/special\\_education/7465](http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/special_education/7465).

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**



### Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2012	Target ≥		28.80%	31.80%	63.00%	63.00%	73.00%	81.00%	
			Data	28.30%	28.50%	31.10%	32.69%	35.30%	42.00%	39.80%	32.70%
Math	A Overall	2012	Target ≥		29.20%	32.20%	56.00%	56.00%	67.00%	78.00%	
			Data	32.40%	33.60%	36.10%	38.86%	45.70%	46.70%	43.60%	37.80%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	38.00%	44.00%	50.00%	56.00%	62.00%	68.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	41.00%	46.00%	51.00%	56.00%	61.00%	66.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania's SEAP has been briefed about the federal requirement to align ESEA and SPP/APR assessment data and targets. PDE establishes AMOs, while SEAP continues to provide input to the BSE regarding improvement activities.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? **yes**

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? **yes**

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	21654	22911	22797	22248	22762	22786	n	n	18907	n	n

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4368	3795	2505	2299	2656	3358			2871		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2701	2864	2222	2436	3224	4692			2050		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1449	1587	1301	1438	1476	1499	n	n	1256	n	n

**Data Source:** SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	21715	22959	22819	22295	22818	22846	n	n	18876	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4809	4485	3067	2879	3121	2997			1851		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4162	4830	3330	3673	4110	3840			1433		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1157	1315	1396	1546	960	1054	n	n	1003	n	n

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	154,065	52,047	32.70%	38.00%	33.78%

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	154,328	57,018	37.80%	41.00%	36.95%

### Public Reporting Information

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

Public reports of assessment results conforming to 34 CFR §300.160(f) are located at <http://www.esaefedreport.com>, and assessment results by accommodation type with the unit of analysis as the state, LEA and the school are located at [http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/special\\_education/7465](http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/special_education/7465).

### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

### Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### Required Actions

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤								
Data	0%	5.40%	2.20%	2.20%	2.80%	2.60%	2.80%	2.60%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.42%	2.42%	2.42%	2.27%	1.97%	1.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders reviewed Pennsylvania’s historical performance and target data for this indicator and recommended that BSE adopt the targets shown above. A more detailed description of stakeholder input appears in the introduction to this document.

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
16	676	2.60%	2.42%	2.37%

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

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

### State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

Pennsylvania determined that an LEA had a significant discrepancy by comparing the suspension/expulsion

rates for children with IEPs among LEAs in the state. To establish baseline, Pennsylvania calculated the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs for LEAs within the state, inclusive of all school districts and charter schools. Pennsylvania determined the state's baseline rate to be 0.78%. A school district or charter school is determined to be significantly discrepant if its rate is two times or greater than 0.78%.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings****

**FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Prior to June 30, 2014, the BSE conducted an on-site review in all 16 LEAs that were identified as having a significant discrepancy. In preparation for the review, each LEA was required to prepare and analyze its suspension data, including an examination of patterns and trends, and policies and procedures for functional behavioral assessment, manifestation determinations, IEPs, procedural safeguards and provision of FAPE to students whose removal constitutes a change of placement. The LEA provided a list to the BSE of all students with disabilities who were suspended during the entire year.

To determine compliance with requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b), the BSE reviewed the LEAs policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and implementation of procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA. The BSE reviewed the LEAs self-assessment during an on-site visit. The Monitoring Chairperson also reviewed a sample of at least 20% of the files of students who were suspended or expelled and considered all data to determine whether the LEA was in compliance with IDEA requirements.

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

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The BSE found noncompliance in five of the 16 LEAs that had been identified with a significant discrepancy. BSE notified these five LEAs that noncompliance had been identified and required them to revise the noncompliant policies, procedures and practices as soon as possible, but not later than one year from notification. The BSE has verified through on-site reviews of policies, practices and procedures, as well as reviews of updated data from student files, that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. BSE verified that all corrective action of noncompliance in these five LEAs was completed within timelines.

- The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The BSE has verified through on-site reviews of policies, procedures and practices, as well as reviews of updated data from student files, that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. BSE verified that all corrective action of noncompliance in these five LEAs was completed within timelines.

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

The BSE has verified through on-site reviews of updated data from student files, that the LEAs have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. BSE verified that each individual case of noncompliance in these five LEAs was completed within timelines.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

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

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
16	1	676	0%	0%	0.15%

### Explanation of Slippage

Pennsylvania's performance declined from 100% compliance to 99.85% compliance as a result of one (1) LEA being identified as having practices that required corrective action.

- All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Pennsylvania uses a comparison to the state average as the methodology for identifying LEAs with a significant discrepancy. Using data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2012-13, submitted November 1, 2013, Pennsylvania compared the rates of suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the state. Pennsylvania



calculated a state level suspension/expulsion rate to set a single “state bar,” then calculated an LEA rate for each racial/ethnic group, and next compared each LEA’s rate for each racial/ethnic group to the single state bar.

LEAs were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities using the following criteria:

- LEA had a total enrollment of students with disabilities of at least 40;
- LEA had suspended or expelled at least 10 students for greater than 10 days in the school year;
- LEA had at least 10 students of one race suspended or expelled; and the rate at which students of any race were suspended or expelled by an LEA was at least 1.5 times the state suspension rate for all students with disabilities in the reporting year (i.e., single bar applicable for all races).

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

**FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review


Based on the criteria and methodology described, BSE identified 16 LEAs as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspension and expulsion by race or ethnicity. The BSE conducted on-site reviews in all 16 LEAs prior to June 30, 2014.

In preparation for the on-site review, each LEA completed a Facilitated Self Assessment (FSA), which required the LEA to examine and describe its written policies, procedures and practices for suspension of students with disabilities. The LEAs provided written responses to a series of probes designed to gather information and gain insights from the LEA team.

During the review, the BSE examined the following:

- written policies and procedures for suspension of students with disabilities;
- suspension data for racial/ethnicity categories where discrepancies exist;
- FSA responses regarding building and LEA-wide suspension patterns;
- professional development program, including training focused on opportunities to increase understanding of the ways in which race, culture, ethnicity and language can influence student behavior and disciplinary practices;
- use of data to plan and implement effective behavior support; and
- information from interviews of LEA personnel.

The BSE Monitoring Chairperson also conducted a student file compliance review for a minimum 20% sample of suspended students.

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

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The BSE conducted reviews as described above, and determined that one LEA had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. Therefore, the state issued written findings of noncompliance. The LEA was required to develop a Corrective Action Verification/Compliance Plan, approved by BSE. The BSE monitored implementation of corrective action through interviews with administrative personnel, analysis of updated suspension data, and student file reviews. The state verified that the LEA has corrected policies, practices and procedures as well as each individual case of noncompliance, in conformance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

The BSE monitored implementation of corrective action through interviews with administrative personnel, analysis of updated suspension data and student file reviews. The state verified that the LEA has corrected policies, procedures and practices in conformance with regulatory requirements.

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

The BSE has verified, through on-site reviews of updated data from student files, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2013 [OR if applicable identified in FFY 2014 based on 2012-2013 data] have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		43.80%	53.00%	57.00%	61.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%
		Data	46.50%	49.70%	53.00%	55.30%	57.80%	61.00%	62.20%	62.10%
B	2005	Target ≤		16.00%	11.30%	10.20%	9.10%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
		Data	14.40%	12.40%	11.10%	10.80%	10.50%	9.60%	9.20%	8.90%
C	2005	Target ≤		4.00%	4.00%	3.70%	3.50%	3.30%	3.30%	3.30%
		Data	4.40%	4.20%	4.40%	4.37%	4.30%	4.30%	4.50%	5.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	62.10%	62.60%	63.10%	63.60%	64.10%	65.00%
Target B ≤	8.90%	8.70%	8.50%	8.30%	8.10%	8.00%
Target C ≤	4.60%	4.60%	4.60%	4.60%	4.60%	4.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders reviewed Pennsylvania’s historical performance and target data as well as national trend data for this indicator and recommended that BSE adopt the targets shown above. A more detailed description of stakeholder input appears in the introduction to this document.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	263,785	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	164,676	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	23,553	null

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	11,077	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	1,074	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	499	null

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	164,676	263,785	62.10%	62.10%	62.43%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	23,553	263,785	8.90%	8.90%	8.93%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	12,650	263,785	5.00%	4.60%	4.80%

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								65.19%
		Data							64.70%	61.82%
B	2011	Target ≤								14.49%
		Data							15.00%	15.88%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%	64.50%	64.80%
Target B ≤	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	14.70%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the SEAP. Using these two groups allows BEIS to gather wide stakeholder input. The Committee for Cohesive Early Intervention (CCEI), a workgroup of the SICC, also focuses on the review of data, specifically data that impacts the coordination of the state’s birth–5 EI system. BEIS presented its data and infrastructure analysis to the SICC, CCEI, and SEAP, and gathered input on targets for the SPP/APR. Membership in the SICC and CCEI is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local EI program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s homeless program.

The BEIS convenes monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, leadership conference in fall). Members of the EI leadership participated in public forums held by the BEIS to gather input on targets for the SPP.

In addition to our ongoing work with stakeholders, Pennsylvania’s EI and school age programs jointly convened a series of stakeholder input sessions. Each of these sessions provided an opportunity to review data on SPP indicators. Approximately 120 stakeholders participated in the input sessions. Early intervention participants included local program leadership, service delivery staff, parents, advocacy groups, and early childhood TA providers (Regional Keys).

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	32,464	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	20,033	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,735	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	488	null
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	9	null

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	20,033	32,464	61.82%	62.00%	61.71%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,232	32,464	15.88%	15.00%	16.12%

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2008	Target ≥					70.80%	71.30%	71.30%	71.30%
		Data				70.80%	70.09%	77.90%	76.60%	88.80%
A2	2008	Target ≥					55.00%	55.50%	55.50%	55.50%
		Data				55.00%	54.93%	57.80%	54.10%	65.50%
B1	2008	Target ≥					72.90%	73.40%	73.40%	73.40%
		Data				72.90%	69.08%	76.70%	76.40%	89.60%
B2	2008	Target ≥					47.20%	47.70%	47.70%	47.70%
		Data				47.20%	46.55%	48.20%	51.90%	63.20%
C1	2008	Target ≥					70.80%	71.30%	71.30%	71.30%
		Data				70.80%	69.06%	74.60%	75.60%	88.10%
C2	2008	Target ≥					56.80%	57.30%	57.30%	57.30%
		Data				56.80%	57.56%	58.00%	57.50%	67.50%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	89.84%	89.84%	89.84%	89.84%	89.84%	90.84%
Target A2 ≥	68.02%	68.02%	68.02%	68.02%	68.02%	69.02%
Target B1 ≥	91.69%	91.69%	91.69%	91.69%	91.69%	92.69%
Target B2 ≥	66.54%	66.54%	66.54%	66.54%	66.54%	67.54%
Target C1 ≥	89.48%	89.48%	89.48%	89.48%	89.48%	90.48%
Target C2 ≥	70.37%	70.37%	70.37%	70.37%	70.37%	71.37%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the SEAP. Using these two groups allows BEIS to gather wide stakeholder input. The Committee for Cohesive Early Intervention (CCEI), a workgroup of the SICC, also focuses on the review of data, specifically data that impacts the coordination of the state’s birth–5 EI system. BEIS presented its data and infrastructure analysis to the SICC, CCEI, and SEAP, and gathered input on targets for the SPP/APR. Membership in the SICC and CCEI is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local EI program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s homeless program.



The BEIS convenes monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, leadership conference in fall). Members of the EI leadership participated in public forums held by the BEIS to gather input on targets for the SPP.

In addition to our ongoing work with stakeholders, Pennsylvania’s EI and school age programs jointly convened a series of stakeholder input sessions. Each of these sessions provided an opportunity to review data on SPP indicators. Approximately 120 stakeholders participated in the input sessions. Early intervention participants included local program leadership, service delivery staff, parents, advocacy groups, and early childhood TA providers (Regional Keys).

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	11,242
------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	75
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	745
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,773
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	4,476
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,165

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	7,249	8,069	88.80%	89.84%	89.84%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	7,641	11,234	65.50%	68.02%	68.02%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	58
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	713
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,991
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	5,518
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,962

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013
--	-----------	-------------	----------	----------	----------

**FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

			Data*	Target*	Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	8,509	9,280	89.60%	91.69%	91.69%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	7,480	11,242	63.20%	66.54%	66.54%

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	75
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	769
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,480
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	4,699
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,194

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	7,179	8,023	88.10%	89.48%	89.48%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	7,893	11,217	67.50%	70.37%	70.37%

**Was sampling used?** No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)?** Yes

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

The State provided progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013. No additional action is required.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? Yes

Will you be providing the data for preschool children separately? Yes

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Preschool	2008	Target ≥				84.20%	85.20%	86.20%	87.20%	88.20%
		Data			83.20%	84.10%	85.90%	87.30%	85.70%	85.90%
School Age	2008	Target ≥				34.13%	34.89%	35.65%	35.65%	35.65%
		Data			34.00%	34.50%	34.30%	39.30%	39.46%	42.26%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Preschool Target ≥	86.50%	86.50%	87.00%	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%
School-age Target ≥	40.34%	40.34%	40.84%	40.84%	41.34%	41.34%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

***School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)***

Stakeholders reviewed Pennsylvania’s historical performance and target data as well as national trend data for this indicator and recommended that BSE adopt the targets shown above. A more detailed description of stakeholder input appears in the introduction to this document.

***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

Pennsylvania’s Early Intervention (EI) system has two primary stakeholder groups, one with a birth-5 focus, the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and one with a 3-21 focus, the SEAP. Using these two groups allows BEIS to gather wide stakeholder input. The Committee for Cohesive Early Intervention (CCEI), a workgroup of the SICC, also focuses on the review of data, specifically data that impacts the coordination of the state’s birth–5 EI system. BEIS presented its data and infrastructure analysis to the SICC, CCEI, and SEAP, and gathered input on targets for the SPP/APR. Membership in the SICC and CCEI is composed of parents (as co-chairs), local EI program administrators, EI service delivery agencies, Department of Health, legislators, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), American Academy of Pediatrics, and a representative of Pennsylvania’s homeless program.

The BEIS convenes monthly EI leadership meetings with administrators of local EI programs. In addition, leadership conferences are held twice annually (Policy Forum in spring, leadership conference in fall). Members of the EI leadership participated in public forums held by the BEIS to gather input on targets for the SPP.

In addition to our ongoing work with stakeholders, Pennsylvania’s EI and school age programs jointly convened a series of stakeholder input sessions. Each of these sessions provided an opportunity to review data on SPP indicators. Approximately 120 stakeholders participated in the input sessions. Early intervention participants included local program leadership, service delivery staff, parents, advocacy groups, and early childhood TA providers (Regional Keys).

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
Preschool	3,709	4,288	85.90%	86.50%	86.50%
School-age	655	1,578	42.26%	40.34%	41.51%

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

**School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)**

For the current reporting year, the school age NCSEAM survey was distributed to 16,276 parents of students with disabilities from 126 LEAs. Included in this distribution was an over-sampling of parents of Black or African American (not Hispanic) and Hispanic students to compensate for historically lower response rates within these groups.

The representativeness of the school age race/ethnicity categories in the survey results (see Table 8.1) was tested using the +/-3% tolerance level established by the Response Calculator developed by the National Post School Outcomes Center (NPSO). The oversampling again had the desired effect of improving the representativeness of the respondent group, as all racial/ethnic categories fell within these tolerance levels.

**Table 8.1  
Race/Ethnicity of School Age Students  
Represented by Parent Respondents**

	Total Respondent Group	State Race/Ethnicity Population
Race/Ethnicity	Percent	Percent
American Indian or Alaskan Native	<1.0	<1.0
Asian	1.1	1.4
Black or African American (not Hispanic)	14.6	17.3
Hispanic or Latino	10.9	10.2

White (not-Hispanic)	71.2	69.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	<1.0	<1.0
Multiracial	2.0	3.1

Table 8.2 shows the representativeness of school age students whose parents responded to the survey when examined by disability category. Overall, the proportions of the disability categories are relatively close to the proportions observed in the December 1 Child Count. Each of the disability categories, with the exceptions of specific learning disabilities and autism, falls within the +/- 3% tolerance level established by the Response Calculator. The proportion of parents of students with specific learning disabilities, which was overrepresented in FFY 2012, is 1.9% below the tolerance level, which may have been an outcome of the state's efforts to improve representativeness. The proportion of respondents who are parents of students with autism lies 0.6% above the tolerance level. These fluctuations from year to year are not unexpected as the state adjusts the sample size to achieve desired representativeness.

**Table 8.2**  
**Disability Category of School Age Students**  
**Represented by Parent Respondents**

	<i>Total Respondent Group</i>	<i>State Disability Population</i>
<i>Disability</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Intellectual Disability	7.8	6.7
Hearing Impairment	1.0	1.0
Speech or Language Impairment	12.9	15.8
Visual Impairment	<1.0	<1.0
Emotional Disturbance	8.9	8.4
Orthopedic Impairment	<1.0	<1.0
Other Health Impairment	14.0	12.3
Specific Learning Disability	39.4	44.3
Deaf-Blindness	<1.0	<1.0
Multiple Disabilities	1.3	1.1
Autism	13.0	9.4
Traumatic Brain Injury	<1.0	<1.0

**Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)**

Table 8.3 displays the racial/ethnic representation of parents of preschool age children who returned the survey. The representativeness of the preschool race/ethnicity categories in the survey results, using the +/-3% tolerance level established by the Response Calculator indicates families in the Black or African American category were underrepresented.

**Table 8.3**

*Respondent Group by Race/Ethnicity for Preschool Children*

	<i>Respondent Group</i>	<i>State Race/Ethnicity Population</i>
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
American Indian or Alaskan Native	<1.0	<1.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.76	2.38
Black or African American(not Hispanic)	11.95	15.03
Hispanic or Latino	13.11	11.74
White (Not-Hispanic)	68.96	66.81
Native Hawaiian or Pacific islander	<1.0	<1.0
Multiracial	3.16	3.90

Table 8.4 shows the representativeness of the preschool respondent group when examining by disability category. Using the +/-3% tolerance level established by the Response Calculator, one category fell below the +/-3% tolerance level. Within the disability categories, families with a child with developmental delays were slightly underrepresented.

In FFY 2014, BEIS will continue to implement a second mailing to obtain representativeness for all population groups and will also identify specific program areas within the state that fall outside the tolerance level for additional targeted mailings. In addition, a stakeholder work group will be developed for the purpose of identifying and supporting local strategies that will increase the response rate of the family survey. BEIS will also use data from the family survey to influence family engagement efforts at the state and local levels. Members of this work group will include programs that voluntarily decide to participate, and programs that are identified and invited based upon their strengths in the family survey process and potential need for improvement.

**Table 8.4**

**Respondent Group by Disability for Preschool Children**

	<i>Respondent Group</i>	<i>State Disability Population</i>
<i>Disability</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Intellectual Disability	<1.0	<1.0
Hearing Impairments	1.07	1.28
Speech or Language Impairments	38.65	35.89
Visual Impairments	<1.0	<1.0
Emotional Disturbance	<1.0	<1.0
Orthopedic Impairments	<1.0	<1.0
Other Health Impairments	1.64	1.62
Specific Learning Disabilities	0.00	<1.0

Deaf-Blindness	<1.0	<1.0
Multiple Disabilities	1.19	1.39
Autism	10.17	9.58
Traumatic Brain Injury	<1.0	<1.0
Developmental Delay	45.11	47.90

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

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

***School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)***

Pennsylvania continues to use the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM) Survey as the measure for this indicator for parents of school age students with disabilities. The NCSEAM standard for school facilitated parent involvement was developed by a group of stakeholders as a part of the NCSEAM National Item Validation Study. This standard, based on the Rasch analysis framework, creates an “agreeability” scale with corresponding calibrations for each survey item. Survey items with lower calibrations are easier to agree with, while items with higher calibrations are more difficult to attain. A respondent’s survey answers are compiled into a single measure. This measure is then compared to the standard established by the stakeholder group.

The sampling plan for this indicator was approved by OSEP in Pennsylvania’s FFY 2005 SPP and is continued for this submission. The present cohort consists of the same set of LEAs on the same schedule as was devised in the original submission. The sampling plan also includes all LEAs that have been established since the original approval.



**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

In this SPP/APR, Pennsylvania has reported whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population. For any disability and race/ethnicity category where representativeness was not achieved, Pennsylvania will implement the strategies of focused oversampling and making additional contacts with families to encourage participation in the survey process.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	592	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

To complete its analysis for this indicator, Pennsylvania compared data collected for the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended (Child Count) for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA and the most current general enrollment data available from the Pennsylvania Information Management System (PIMS) system.

The following methodology and criteria were applied to identify the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services:

- o weighted risk ratio analysis;
- o same threshold (single bar) for all racial categories;
- o cut point of 3.0 for the upper bound;

- minimum cell size of 40 students with disabilities in racial category; and
- two consecutive years of data indicating disproportionate representation.

Pennsylvania analyzed data for each LEA, and for all racial and ethnic groups in the LEA that met the minimum cell size. The decision to require two consecutive years of data is based on fluctuation in enrollment in Pennsylvania’s LEAs, especially in its charter schools.

Using the above criteria, the state determined that no LEA met the data threshold as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations



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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

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

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

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

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
2	0	592	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

To complete its analysis for this indicator, Pennsylvania compared data collected for the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the IDEA, as amended (Child Count) for all children with disabilities aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA and the most current general enrollment data available from PIMS.

The following methodology and criteria were applied to identify the number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories:

- weighted risk ratio (WRR) analysis,
- same threshold (single bar) for all racial categories,
- cut point of 3.0 for the upper bound,

- minimum cell size of 40 students with disabilities in racial category, and
- two consecutive years of data indicating disproportionate representation.

Pennsylvania analyzed data for children in each LEA in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disability, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairment, other health impairment, and autism, and for all racial and ethnic groups in the LEA that met the minimum cell size. The decision to require two consecutive years of data is based on fluctuation in enrollment in Pennsylvania’s LEAs, especially in its charter schools.

Using the above criteria, the BSE determined that one LEA met the data threshold as having disproportionate representation for students with learning disabilities who are Black or African American, and one LEA met the data threshold for students with autism in the reporting category of Two or More Races.

To determine whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, BSE conducted timely on-site monitoring in the LEAs and determined that the LEAs did not have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. The LEAs complied with the eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 11: Child Find**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.35%	90.00%	93.00%	98.30%	96.50%	95.00%	96.00%	93.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
28,302	26,766	93.00%	100%	94.57%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1,536
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

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.

**School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)**

BSE’s review of the FFY 2013 database for indicator 11 confirms that all 396 school age students that did not receive a timely initial evaluation did receive an evaluation, although late. Of those that were late, 85% were completed within 61-90 days and 94% were completed within 120 days. Reasons for delays were primarily attributed to errors in timeline calculations, staffing issues and administrative delays, as well as weather emergencies and scheduling problems over which the LEA had limited control.

**Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)**

Data indicate that the range of delays for the majority of children in preschool programs is between 1-120 days. Of those that were late, 63% were completed within 61-90 days and 80% were completed within 120 days. The most common reasons for delays for preschool programs were related to family and personnel scheduling issues (e.g., illness, vacations, inclement weather, cancellations, missed appointments) and staff errors (delay in completing reports, reports sent late, changes in staff assignments, documenting dates

incorrectly). All 1140 children whose initial evaluation was delayed did receive an evaluation.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

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

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

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

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

**School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)**

LEAs submit required data for Indicator 11 on a cyclical basis aligned with BSE's monitoring cycle (approximately one-sixth of the LEAs in the Commonwealth are monitored each year). Student specific and aggregated data sufficient to address all technical reporting requirements for this indicator are collected. Data were reported as the actual number of days, not an average number of days, for the period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

**Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)**

For Preschool Early Intervention Programs, Pennsylvania collected data for this indicator through a statewide data collection and is based on actual number of days, not an average number of days for the period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
56	48	8	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

**School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)**

The process for collecting data is explained above. Annually, in July-August, BSE reviews a database in

which LEAs report data from the entire year for all students who have had initial evaluations for special education. The database includes mandatory reporting fields to document that for any student where the LEA did not meet required timelines, an initial evaluation was conducted, although late, and an IEP was developed if determined appropriate. Following BSE review of the database, all LEAs are provided with written notification of their compliance status. LEAs determined to be in noncompliance are informed that they must correct the noncompliance as soon as possible, but not later than one year from the notification. These LEAs are required to do quarterly reporting, through which the LEA provides updated data on all new initial evaluations. When the LEA demonstrates 100% compliance with evaluation timelines for two consecutive quarters, BSE closes corrective action. If an LEA is not demonstrating progress through quarterly reports, BSE conducts on-site reviews to assist in identifying root causes, including required technical assistance. BSE also informs the LEA of pending enforcement actions should the LEA not correct the noncompliance within the one year timeline (from the date of the original notification).

BSE conducted follow-up of all LEAs identified with noncompliance through quarterly reporting and in some instances conducted on-site reviews of student files as well as policies and procedures. Eight LEAs did not achieve closure of corrective action within one year of notification. BSE advisors examined written policies and procedures and student files in each of the LEAs to verify correct implementation of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). One of the eight LEAs achieved closure after two additional days, two LEAs achieved closure after 70 additional days, four LEAs achieved closure after 84 additional days and one after 97 additional days. BSE has confirmed that all eight LEAs have achieved 100% compliance with evaluation timelines for two consecutive quarters, and has closed the corrective action.

### ***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

BEIS conducts annual data reviews from the statewide data management system for all preschool early intervention programs. All child records in the data management system are reviewed to determine the rate of compliance for this indicator for all programs. Any program with a compliance rate less than 100% is issued a written finding of noncompliance. Corrective action is required for the correction of all individual child instances of noncompliance and for the implementation of the specific regulatory requirement.

A subsequent review of data is completed six months after the issuance of the letter identifying noncompliance. An additional sampling of subsequent child records is completed to verify preschool early intervention programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Compliance with timelines for timely evaluations is also a component of on-site verification reviews. BEIS staff conducts on-site reviews which include data reviews, review of policies, individual child record reviews and observations of service delivery. Preschool early intervention programs are required to submit an improvement plan, approved by BEIS, to address all areas of noncompliance. The plan's implementation is validated within one year of issuance of the findings report.

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

### ***School Age Programs (Bureau of Special Education)***

BSE has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported in the FFY 2012 APR has corrected noncompliance and: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., have achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data collected within its database, or in some cases through both the database and on-site monitoring; and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

### ***Preschool Early Intervention Programs (Bureau of Early Intervention Services)***

BEIS conducts annual data reviews from the statewide data management system for all preschool early intervention programs. All child records in the data management system are reviewed to determine the rate of compliance for this indicator for all programs. Any program with a compliance rate less than 100% is



issued a written finding of noncompliance. Corrective action is required for the correction of all individual child instances of noncompliance and the assurance that all children had received services, although late. A subsequent review of data was completed 6 months after the issuance of the letter to verify that all individual instances of noncompliance were corrected.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

### Required Actions

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.80%	95.10%	95.30%	97.00%	95.00%	95.00%	98.00%	98.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	6,626
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	406
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	5,595
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	367
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	178

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	5,595	5,675	98.00%	100%	98.59%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	80
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

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.

For FFY 2013, 99% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who were found eligible for Part B had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. Reasons for delays included delays in the evaluation process, personnel scheduling issues (e.g., illness, vacations, inclement weather, cancellations, missed appointments), staff errors (e.g., delay in completing evaluation reports, changes in staff assignments, documenting dates incorrectly) and delays in transition meetings for children transitioning from Part C. Of

the 80 children whose IEP was not developed by their third birthday, 58 had their IEP developed within 30 days. Another 22 had their IEPs developed between 31-89 days. All 80 children did have an IEP developed and implemented, although beyond their third birthday, as confirmed through data reports.

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

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

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

Pennsylvania collected data for this indicator through a statewide data collection and is based on actual number of days, not an average number of days, for the period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

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

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

BEIS conducts annual data reviews from the statewide data management system for all preschool early intervention programs. All child records in the data management system are reviewed to determine the rate of compliance for this indicator for all programs. Any program with a compliance rate less than 100% is issued a written finding of noncompliance. Corrective action is required for the correction of all individual child instances of noncompliance and for the implementation of the specific regulatory requirement.

A subsequent review of data is completed six months after the issuance of the letter identifying noncompliance. An additional sampling of subsequent child records is completed to verify preschool early intervention programs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

Compliance with timelines for timely service delivery is also a component of on-site verification reviews. BEIS staff conducts on-site reviews which include data reviews, review of policies, individual child record reviews and observations of service delivery. Preschool early intervention programs are required to submit an improvement plan, approved by BEIS, to address all areas of noncompliance. The plan’s implementation is validated within one year of issuance of the findings report.

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

BEIS conducts annual data reviews from the statewide data management system for all preschool early

intervention programs. All child records in the data management system are reviewed to determine the rate of compliance for this indicator for all programs. Any program with a compliance rate less than 100% is issued a written finding of noncompliance. Corrective action is required for the correction of all individual child instances of noncompliance and the assurance that all children had received services, although late. A subsequent review of data was completed six months after the issuance of the letter to verify that all individual instances of noncompliance were corrected.

### OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

### Required Actions

### Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					76.10%	81.40%	86.60%	83.20%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
501	641	83.20%	100%	78.16%

#### Explanation of Slippage

Pennsylvania collects its indicator 13 data through onsite monitoring. Student files are reviewed in detail to assess compliance. Monitoring probes are aligned with the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center’s (NSTTAC) *Indicator 13 Checklist*, and are scored in accordance with strictest guidelines. In order to meet requirements (and thus be reported at 100% for this indicator), a file must have 100% compliance for all probes. An LEA that does not achieve 100% compliance is issued findings of noncompliance, and required corrective action is implemented and tracked by BSE.

The measured performance on this indicator declined from FFY 2012 to FFY 2013. However, further analyses revealed that although all records did not reflect 100% compliance with the required probes, 91.2% of the 4,839 probes examined were found to be in compliance. Compliance on the most substantive measures related to student outcomes, e.g., appropriate goals and transition services, remained high, while procedural compliance was not always as well documented. School district performance on the indicator was substantially better than charter school performance, and the western region of the state had higher compliance than the central or eastern areas. This will allow BSE and PaTTAN to further target technical assistance.

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

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

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

BSE collects data for this indicator from LEAs participating in cyclical and focused monitoring, with approximately one-sixth of the state's LEAs engaged in on-site monitoring each year. The Pennsylvania State Data Center selects a representative sample of student files for monitoring, using parameters established by the BSE. Secondary transition probes within the BSE's monitoring documents are aligned with the NSTTAC *Indicator 13 Checklist*. BSE monitoring chairpersons and peer monitors are trained on all components of the monitoring system, with particular emphasis for peer monitors in conducting file reviews and scoring requirements. Training includes guided practice.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
68	68	0	0

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

*Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

When findings of noncompliance are issued, the LEA is informed of the regulation that is being violated (linked to federal and state regulations) and must develop a CAVP that is approved by the BSE. The CAVP is also linked to technical assistance resources through the PaTTAN and IU systems. The CAVP addresses correction of policies, practices and procedures to ensure systemic correction. CAVPs include required corrective action/evidence of change, timelines and resources required, and tracking of timelines to closure. The BSE monitors implementation of the CAVP primarily through on-site reviews of revised policies and procedures and verification of correction as evidenced by data in a sample of student files. The CAVP is monitored until all corrective action has been completed. All corrective action must be completed within one year of the notification of a finding. Because the system is web-based, BSE is able to track progress in closing the CAVP and can capture real-time status data concerning status in completing corrective action.

BSE has follow-up procedures in place to verify correction of noncompliance. In addition to systemic correction of noncompliance, the BSE reviewed the files of all students whose IEPs were not in compliance with indicator 13 transition requirements in FFY 2012 monitoring, and reviewed the students’ updated IEPs until all noncompliance was corrected. The BSE ensured correction of noncompliance systemically and specifically for every individual student whose IEP had noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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

BSE has verified that all noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner. BSE has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2012 data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data collected through on-site monitoring; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						28.10%	28.20%	28.30%
		Data					27.99%	31.16%	26.90%	25.00%
B	2009	Target ≥						49.10%	49.20%	49.30%
		Data					48.90%	63.78%	61.90%	60.00%
C	2009	Target ≥						66.00%	66.00%	66.00%
		Data					65.84%	73.56%	73.00%	66.70%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	25.00%	25.70%	26.40%	27.10%	27.80%	28.50%
Target B ≥	60.00%	60.40%	60.80%	61.00%	62.00%	65.00%
Target C ≥	66.70%	67.80%	68.80%	69.90%	70.90%	72.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders reviewed Pennsylvania’s historical performance and target data for this indicator and recommended that BSE adopt the targets shown above. A more detailed description of stakeholder input appears in the introduction to this document.

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	2,114
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	515
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	751
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	90
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	10

	Number of	Number of	FFY 2012	FFY 2013	FFY 2013
--	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------



	respondent youth	respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	Data*	Target*	Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	515	2,114	25.00%	25.00%	24.36%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,266	2,114	60.00%	60.00%	59.89%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1,366	2,114	66.70%	66.70%	64.62%

**Explanation of C Slippage**

The number of respondents to the Post School Outcomes Survey increased by 43, or just over 1% from FFY 2012. While the proportion of respondents for category 14A slightly decreased, this represented only three individuals. Although the performance for category 14B also decreased, the number of respondents who were competitively employed actually increased by 0.5%, or 26 students. The largest change in performance from year to year was observed in category 14C. Here, the slippage can be explained by the fact that 2.1% fewer respondents, or 43, were enrolled in other postsecondary education or training programs. The proportion of respondents who reported some other employment increased by 0.5%.

**Was sampling used?** Yes

**Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?** No

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

The sampling plan for this indicator was approved by OSEP in Pennsylvania's FFY 2005 SPP and is continued for this submission. The present cohort consists of the same set of LEAs on the same schedule as was devised in the original submission. The sampling plan also includes all LEAs that have been established since the original approval. This group of LEAs provides a representative sample of leavers based on LEA size, whether the LEAs are urban, suburban or rural, disability category, race/ethnicity and gender.

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

The NPSO Response Calculator was used to calculate representativeness of the respondent group by disability, race/ethnicity, gender, and dropout status in order to determine whether the youth who responded were similar to, or different from, the total population of youth with an IEP who exited sampled LEAs in 2012-13.

According to the Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of ±3% are important. Negative differences indicate underrepresentativeness of the group and positive differences indicate overrepresentativeness.

Representativeness of minority leavers has fluctuated from year to year, and this group is underrepresented in the current survey, but more severely than in recent years. Unique to FFY 2013, female leavers are also severely underrepresented in this year's respondent pool. The difference in the proportion of leavers with learning disabilities, intellectual disabilities and emotional disturbance, along with a category comprised of low incidence disabilities, all fall within the  $\pm 3\%$  tolerance level. The difference in the proportion of leavers who dropped out of school also falls within that tolerance level.

During the span of its Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes Survey, Pennsylvania has implemented a wide range of sound strategies to address sporadic underrepresentation in the annual response rates of various subgroups. Additional improvement activities are currently underway and are described below.

Enhanced presentations about the importance of obtaining representative response rates will occur during mandatory annual training for LEAs administering Exit Surveys and Post School Outcome Surveys. PaTTAN consultants will review state summary information and address any specific concerns about representativeness in previous surveys. The NPSO's *Strategies for Hard to Reach Students* will also be reviewed.

Participating LEAs will receive a mid-point status report alerting them to any potential discrepancies in response rates for specific subgroups. LEAs will then be expected to increase the intensity of efforts to contact former students, especially those in affected subgroups.

LEAs with high PaPOS response rates will be engaged in a focus group meeting to discuss the strategies they employed to contact youth, especially hard to reach youth. Information from the focus group will be used to develop additional guidance documents for future cohorts of LEAs administering the PaPOS surveys.

BSE will continue collaborating with the former NPSO (now a part of the National Technical Assistance Center on Improving Transition to Postsecondary Education and Employment for Students with Disabilities) to research other states' survey procedures, with specific focus on effective strategies for improving representativeness in response rates.

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		- 67.00%	50.00% - 60.00%	50.00% - 60.00%	50.00% - 60.00%	50.00% - 60.00%	50.00% - 60.00%	50.00% - 60.00%
Data	67.00%	33.00%	52.00%	41.00%	70.00%	37.98%	35.03%	27.38%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	24.00% - 35.00%	24.00% - 35.00%	24.00% - 35.00%	24.00% - 35.00%	24.00% - 35.00%	28.00% - 38.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders reviewed Pennsylvania’s historical performance and target data for this indicator, as well as national trend data for resolution agreements reported by CADRE, and recommended that BSE reset baseline based on the state’s FFY 2012 performance of 27%. Stakeholders also recommended that targets continue to be expressed as a range. A more detailed description of stakeholder input appears in the introduction to this document.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	127	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	382	null

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
127	382	27.38%	24.00% - 35.00%	33.25%

### Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		- 80.80%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%
Data	79.30%	77.80%	77.00%	77.00%	68.40%	76.50%	79.80%	77.78%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	75.00% - 85.00%	79.50% - 89.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders reviewed Pennsylvania’s historical performance and target data for this indicator, as well as national trend data for mediation agreements reported by CADRE, and recommended that 75-85% is an acceptable target range for mediation agreements through FFY 2017. The terminal target for FFY 2018 was incremented to meet OSEP requirements. A more detailed description of stakeholder input appears in the introduction to this document.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	80	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	113	null

### FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
7	80	113	77.78%	75.00% - 85.00%	76.99%

**Actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

None

**Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table**

**OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target					

### Description of Measure

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### Data Analysis

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

### Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

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

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

## FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

*Statement*

*Description*

### Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

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

### Theory of Action

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

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

**Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)**

Description of Illustration

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions



## Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

**Selected:** Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Patricia Hozella

Title: Director, Bureau of Special Education

Email: pathozella@pa.gov

Phone: 717-783-6134