

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 and improvement activities for FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 76%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 73.26%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 84%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>																
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 3.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1062 1583 1330"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>FFY 2009 Data</th> <th>FFY 2010 Data</th> <th>FFY 2010 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Elementary</td> <td>0%</td> <td>73%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Middle</td> <td>0%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>9%</td> <td>73%</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets.</p>	Level	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target	Elementary	0%	73%	58%	Middle	0%	81%	58%	High	9%	73%	70%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
Level	FFY 2009 Data	FFY 2010 Data	FFY 2010 Target															
Elementary	0%	73%	58%															
Middle	0%	81%	58%															
High	9%	73%	70%															
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance</p>																

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 313 1583 748"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>99.8%</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>99.9%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>99.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>98.7%</td> <td>98.8%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.3%</td> <td>99.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>99.5%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>99.6%</td> <td>99.7%</td> <td>99.2%</td> <td>99.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>97.6%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>98.2%</td> <td>98.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>97.7%</td> <td>98.3%</td> <td>98.6%</td> <td>97.7%</td> <td>98.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>97.3%</td> <td>97.7%</td> <td>99.1%</td> <td>97.5%</td> <td>97.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>96.2%</td> <td>92.1%</td> <td>95.9%</td> <td>96.6%</td> <td>91.5%</td> <td>95.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	99.8%	99.2%	99.3%	99.9%	99.1%	99.4%	4	99.7%	98.7%	98.8%	99.7%	99.3%	99.1%	5	99.5%	99.1%	99.6%	99.7%	99.2%	99.4%	6	98.3%	97.6%	98.5%	98.3%	98.2%	98.6%	7	98.3%	97.7%	98.3%	98.6%	97.7%	98.4%	8	98.9%	97.3%	97.7%	99.1%	97.5%	97.5%	HS	96.2%	92.1%	95.9%	96.6%	91.5%	95.5%	<p>and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	99.8%	99.2%	99.3%	99.9%	99.1%	99.4%																																																											
4	99.7%	98.7%	98.8%	99.7%	99.3%	99.1%																																																											
5	99.5%	99.1%	99.6%	99.7%	99.2%	99.4%																																																											
6	98.3%	97.6%	98.5%	98.3%	98.2%	98.6%																																																											
7	98.3%	97.7%	98.3%	98.6%	97.7%	98.4%																																																											
8	98.9%	97.3%	97.7%	99.1%	97.5%	97.5%																																																											
HS	96.2%	92.1%	95.9%	96.6%	91.5%	95.5%																																																											
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1049 1583 1490"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>45%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>80%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>37%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>80%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>69%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>41%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>80%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>30%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>69%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>41%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>68%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>34%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>65%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>21%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	45%	33%	80%	46%	35%	69%	4	37%	30%	80%	39%	35%	69%	5	41%	29%	80%	39%	31%	68%	6	30%	28%	69%	33%	23%	58%	7	41%	26%	68%	28%	27%	50%	8	34%	24%	65%	29%	26%	50%	HS	21%	31%	50%	22%	27%	45%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	45%	33%	80%	46%	35%	69%																																																											
4	37%	30%	80%	39%	35%	69%																																																											
5	41%	29%	80%	39%	31%	68%																																																											
6	30%	28%	69%	33%	23%	58%																																																											
7	41%	26%	68%	28%	27%	50%																																																											
8	34%	24%	65%	29%	26%	50%																																																											
HS	21%	31%	50%	22%	27%	45%																																																											

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 18.92%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 8.1%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that two districts that exceeded the State’s relative difference measure did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 15 children with disabilities who were expelled or suspended for more than ten days. The total number of districts in the State was 37.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 8.1%. The State revised its calculation methodology from that used in FFY 2009, therefore OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that six districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State also reported that three districts were identified as having 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.</p>	<p>The State did not report on whether it revised (or required the affected districts to revise) policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required in 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report whether, as a result of the review, the State revised, or required the affected districts to revise policies, procedures, and</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported a minimum "n" size requirement of ten students with disabilities in the race or ethnic group who were suspended or expelled. However, OSEP is unable to determine the total number of districts that did not meet the State established minimum "n" size.</p> <p>The State did not report on whether it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), the districts' policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p>	<p>practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State did not, until FFY 2011, determine whether districts with 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, based on FFY 2009 data, had 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, and therefore did not make findings of noncompliance until FFY 2011. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator for districts with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>discipline data. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that these districts 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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 APR, the State must report the total number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement.</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, and FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 464 1583 938"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">58.7</td> <td align="center">60.5</td> <td align="center">65</td> <td align="center">1.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">16.9</td> <td align="center">16.1</td> <td align="center">17.7</td> <td align="center">0.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">5.2</td> <td align="center">6.2</td> <td align="center">3.6</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5C.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58.7	60.5	65	1.80%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16.9	16.1	17.7	0.80%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	5.2	6.2	3.6	-1.00%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	58.7	60.5	65	1.80%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16.9	16.1	17.7	0.80%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	5.2	6.2	3.6	-1.00%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 412 1583 1425"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 412 957 513"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 412 1163 513"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 412 1373 513"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 412 1583 513"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 513 957 646">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 513 1163 646">86.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 513 1373 646">90.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 513 1583 646">90.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 646 957 816">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 646 1163 816">87.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 646 1373 816">89.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 646 1583 816">93.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 816 957 919">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 816 1163 919">86.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 816 1373 919">91.5</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 816 1583 919">91.9</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 919 957 1019"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 919 1163 1019"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 919 1373 1019"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 919 1583 1019"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1019 957 1154">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1019 1163 1154">51.4</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1019 1373 1154">63.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1019 1583 1154">60.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1154 957 1325">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1154 1163 1325">46.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1154 1373 1325">52.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1154 1583 1325">54.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1325 957 1425">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="957 1325 1163 1425">64.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1325 1373 1425">73.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1325 1583 1425">64.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY</p>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.3	90.9	90.6	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	87.2	89.9	93.0	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	86.3	91.5	91.9	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	51.4	63.0	60.3	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	46.0	52.8	54.4	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	64.9	73.2	64.9	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.3	90.9	90.6																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	87.2	89.9	93.0																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	86.3	91.5	91.9																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	51.4	63.0	60.3																															
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	46.0	52.8	54.4																															
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	64.9	73.2	64.9																															

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	2010 targets for this indicator.	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 86%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 85.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 86%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2.78%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that two of the 12 districts identified based on the relative difference measure did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of ten. The total number of districts in the State was 37.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in 2008 for this indicator was corrected.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 APR, the State must report the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement.</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that the number of districts that did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten ranged from zero to 16 depending on the racial or ethnic category examined.</p>	
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.2%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all four of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.75%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100%</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 80.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 88.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all nine of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>										
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1382 1583 1516"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher</td> <td align="center">24</td> <td align="center">20</td> <td align="center">28</td> <td align="center">-4.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher	24	20	28	-4.00%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Enrolled in higher	24	20	28	-4.00%								

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	education					
	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	71	51	77	-20.00%	
	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	100	65	100	-35.00%	
<p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>						
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.4%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 56 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4B, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data are based on four complaints. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearings during the reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that no resolution sessions were held during the reporting period.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that six of eight mediations resulted in mediation agreements. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 75%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.18%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95.35%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 90.48%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. In reporting on</p>

Delaware Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.