

Cluster Area IV – Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment (FAPE)

Question		
Do all children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment that promotes a high quality education and prepares them for employment and independent living?		
Goals*		
1. All children with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment that promotes a high quality education and prepares them for employment and independent living		
Probe: BF. I		
Probes (2003-04)	Performance Indicators (2003-04)	
BF. I Does the State review data to determine if significant disproportionality in identification, eligibility category or placement is occurring, and if it identifies significant disproportionality, does the State review and as appropriate revise policies, procedures and practices?	<p>A. Monitoring through Coordinated Program Reviews' (CPR) Methods of Administration 4 (MOA) indicates that LEAs have appropriate policies and procedures to address issues of disproportionality in their district.</p> <p>B. According to state data collected through the Student Information Management System (SIMS), the percentage of children with disabilities, by race/ethnicity, receiving special education is proportionate to the percentage of children, by race/ethnicity, in the general population and their educational environments.</p>	
Performance Indicator A		
Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)	Targets (2003-04)	Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)
<p>A.</p> <p>CPR RESULTS FOR MOA 4: FY01 –FY04, Mid-cycle FY04</p> <p>Data on Disproportionality</p>	<p style="color: red;">*</p> <p>A.</p> <p>DISPROPORTIONALITY</p> <p>School districts will have</p>	<p>A.</p> <p>DISPROPORTIONALITY</p> <p>In FY04, MASSDE continued developing a structured, collaborative process to</p>

MOA 4 Placement of linguistic and racial minority, disabled, and female/male students

MOA 4	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Commendable/Implemented	69%	85%	82%	100%
Partially Implemented/Not Implemented	31%	15%	18%	0%
Total Sites	54	48	49	45

MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04

Of the 17 LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for MOA 4 in FY01, 16 (94%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.

appropriate procedures and policies in place to address disproportionality as measured by compliance levels above 90% on MOA4.

assist education agencies in monitoring and addressing disproportionality. In FY03, MASSDE had designed the Methods of Administration 4 (MOA) framework as a guide for identifying, monitoring, and addressing racial, linguistic, gender, and disability status disproportionality (see [Appendix A.4 Civil Rights: Methods of Administration](#)).

During FY04, MASSDE built upon this framework and developed a directed guide for identifying, monitoring, and addressing disproportionality (see [Appendix A.7 Coordinated Program Review Procedures: PQA Staff Guide & Procedures for Monitoring and Addressing Disproportionality](#)). It defines the critical issues and questions, the data needed to answer the questions, the sources of these data, and the standard to be used in analysis. Space is provided in the framework for entering the analysis conducted by MASSDE teams, which forms the foundation for corrective action planning.

The data presented from the Coordinated Program Reviews (CPR) conducted by MASSDE through the Program Quality Assurance unit (PQA) for FY04 indicates that 100% of districts monitored were found "Commendable or Implemented". While the years prior to FY04 were considered "pilot data", the compliance rate has been high for three consecutive years.

It is important to note that MASSDE is now able to compare cohort groups by reviewing the mid-cycle data as compared to the CPR data. With the first year of Mid-cycle Reviews completed, MASSDE is able to effectively ensure that noncompliance identified during the FY01 CPRs has been corrected. For the one LEA that remained noncompliant with MOA 4, MASSDE prescribed corrective action. The LEA must implement this corrective action without delay or face possible loss of funds to the district and/or other enforcement action by MASSDE. CPR data cohorts will begin comparability as of FY07.

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

Maintain existing target.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

MASSDE, through Program Quality Assurance, Data Collections and Reporting, and Special Education Planning and Policy staff time, will utilize student-level data collected through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) to develop comprehensive data reports for each district being monitored through the Coordinated Program Review (CPR) system in FY05. MASSDE will invest resources into training CPR team members to use the data reports to identify possible instances of disproportionality and to use these analyses to guide the review process and the development of corrective action plans.

Performance Indicator B

Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)	Targets (2003-04)	Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)
<p>B. ATTACHMENT 2</p> <p>See Attachment 2 - Disproportionality Baseline/Trend Data</p>	<p>B. ATTACHMENT 2</p> <p>The percentage of children with disabilities, by race/ethnicity, receiving special education is proportionate to the percentage of children, by race/ethnicity, in the general population and their educational environments.</p>	<p>B. ATTACHMENT 2</p> <p>In FY04, for the first time, MASSDE was able to utilize student-level data collected through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) in order to determine if significant disproportionality based on race is occurring in the state with respect to the identification and placement of children with disabilities. The data presented in Attachment 2 is considered baseline data; before MASSDE is able to determine if systemic disproportionality is occurring at the state level, at least three years of data are needed. (See the Explanation of Progress or Slippage document attached to Attachment 2 for analysis of baseline data)</p>

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

Maintain target.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

- MASSDE will continue to work with LEAs to ensure accurate and timely reporting of special education data related to race, educational environment and disability.
- MASSDE, through Program Quality Assurance, Data Collections and Reporting, and Special Education Planning and Policy staff time, will continue to analyze data related to possible instances of disproportionality at both the state and LEA level. Additionally, MASSDE will consider if it should continue to use the *relative difference* calculation for conducting disproportionality analyses, or if it should begin using *risk ratios* and *weighted risk ratios* to identify possible instances of disproportionate representation.

Probe: BF. II

Probes (2003-04)	Performance Indicators (2003-04)
<p>BF.II Are high school graduation rates, and dropout rates, for children with disabilities comparable to graduation rates and dropout rates for non-disabled children?</p>	<p>C. The high school dropout rates for children with disabilities are comparable to dropout rates for non-disabled children as indicated through the Student Information Management System (SIMS).</p>
	<p>D. Graduation rates for children with disabilities are comparable to graduation rates for non-disabled children as indicated through the Student Information Management System (SIMS).</p>

Performance Indicator C

Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)	Targets (2003-04)	Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)									
<p>C. DROPPED OUT</p> <p>Figure 1: Dropout Rates for Children with Disabilities and Non-disabled Students, Grades 9-12: School Year 2003-04 (source: Student Information Management System)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="86 524 682 748"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2003 Dropout Rate</th> <th>2004 Dropout Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>4.6%</td> <td>5.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Disabled</td> <td>3.1%</td> <td>3.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2003 Dropout Rate	2004 Dropout Rate	SPED	4.6%	5.3%	Non-Disabled	3.1%	3.7%	<p>* C. DROPPED OUT</p> <p>The dropout rate for students with disabilities will be no higher than the dropout rate for students without disabilities.</p>	<p>C. DROPPED OUT</p> <p>FY04 marks the first time that the dropout rate in Massachusetts is reported based on student-level data submitted by districts through the Student Information Management System (SIMS). The MASSDE defines a dropout as a student with or without a disability in grades nine through twelve who left school prior to graduation for reasons other than to transfer to another school. The dropout measure coincides with the dropout measure developed by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Center for Education Statistics. Students who drop out during the school year but who return to school by October 1 of the following year are not counted as dropouts. (Returning students are referred to as <i>returned dropouts</i>.) The dropout rate reflects the number of students with or without disabilities who dropped out over a one-year period, from July 1 to June 30, minus the number of returned dropouts, divided by the October 1 enrollment for the school year being reported.</p> <p>The October data collected allows MASSDE to determine how many students have returned to school of the total number of dropouts in June. The returned dropouts are removed from the total number of dropouts determined in June, providing an adjusted number of dropouts. The adjusted number of dropouts include students with or without disabilities who meet the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Enrolled in school some time during the previous school year b) Reported as a dropout during the previous school year and not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year (October 1) c) Did not graduate or receive a certificate of attainment from high school or completed a state approved educational program in or out of state in June d) Has not transferred to another public, private or state approved educational program in or out of state e) Is not temporarily absent due to expulsion, suspension or school approved medical absence <p>According to the baseline data presented, the dropout rate reported for students with disabilities is higher than students without disabilities who dropped out during the 2003-2004 school year. We cannot compare the 2004 data to the 2003 with much certainty due to a change in the calculation of dropouts. However, the rates for both students with disabilities and non-disabled students reportedly increased from 2003 to the 2004 baseline data. In both 2003 and 2004, the dropout rates were higher for students with disabilities than non-disabled students.</p>
	2003 Dropout Rate	2004 Dropout Rate									
SPED	4.6%	5.3%									
Non-Disabled	3.1%	3.7%									

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

Maintain target.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

MASSDE will analyze dropout data to identify demographic and educational patterns among dropouts, and will work with the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) to explore opportunities and programs to reduce dropout rates for students with disabilities.

Performance Indicator D

Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)	Targets (2003-04)	Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)									
<p>D. GRADUATE</p> <p>COMPETENCY DETERMINATION RATE <i>Figure 2: Competency Determination (CD) Rates for Children with Disabilities and Non-disabled Students: Class of 2003 and 2004</i> (source: MASSDE Progress Report on Competency Determination)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">2003 CD Rate</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2004 CD Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">SPED</td> <td style="text-align: center;">84.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">83.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Non-Disabled</td> <td style="text-align: center;">96.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">97.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>See also Appendix F.1 Competency Determination Rate Charts 1 and 2 for <i>Percentage of Students with Disabilities with a Competency Determination: Classes of 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006 and Difference in Competency Determination Rates Between Students with Disabilities and Non-disabled Students: Classes of 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006.</i></p> <p><i>Figure 3: Count of Graduates -- Children with Disabilities and Non-disabled Students</i></p>		2003 CD Rate	2004 CD Rate	SPED	84.7%	83.8%	Non-Disabled	96.7%	97.4%	<p style="text-align: center;">*</p> <p>D. GRADUATE</p> <p>The CD attainment rate of students with disabilities will be the same as the CD attainment rate of students without disabilities.</p>	<p>D. GRADUATE</p> <p>MCAS GRADUATION REQUIREMENT Prior to 2002-03, diplomas were granted based solely on local criteria and certificates were not used in Massachusetts. The 2002-03 school year was the first year that a specific requirement for a diploma included passing a statewide assessment called the Massachusetts Comprehensive Statewide Assessment (MCAS). MASSDE now requires that all students at grade-levels being tested participate in MCAS, including students in charter schools, in institutional school programs, in educational collaborative programs, in private schools receiving publicly funded special education, students with disabilities who either have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or receive Section 504 instructional accommodations, and students with limited English proficiency (unless they have been enrolled in United States schools for three or fewer years AND who are ineligible for the Spanish-language version of MCAS).</p> <p>COMPETENCY DETERMINATION RATE Massachusetts does not currently report graduation rates for any student groups. At its December 2002 meeting, the Massachusetts Board of Education approved modifying the Massachusetts School and District Accountability System to include graduation rates as an additional performance indicator for high schools. The Department will begin reporting graduation rates using the NCLB definition in the 2005-06 school year, using Student Information Management System (SIMS) data.</p> <p>MASSDE is utilizing the competency determination (CD) attainment rate in the interim to identify a graduation rate. The CD rate is the rate of students in the graduating class of 2004 who met or exceeded the Needs Improvement threshold on both the English Language Arts and Mathematics MCAS grade 10 tests in order to satisfy the requirements of the CD. A student who receives a CD is then eligible to receive a diploma upon completion of local requirements. <i>Figure 2</i> reflects the first two years of data in which the CD was a requirement for graduation.</p> <p>As indicated in <i>Figure 2</i>, the CD rate for students with disabilities in the graduating class of 2004 is below that of non-disabled students. However, Appendix F.1 Competency Determination Rate Charts 1 and 2 projects that students with disabilities will earn CDs at higher rates in future years and will make significant progress toward the goal of graduating at rates comparable to those of students</p>
	2003 CD Rate	2004 CD Rate									
SPED	84.7%	83.8%									
Non-Disabled	96.7%	97.4%									

Grades 9-12: School Year 2003-04
(source: Student Information Management System)

	2003 Number of Graduates	2004 Number of Graduates
SPED	5,246	6,285
Non-Disabled	50,741	52,040

without disabilities. The *Chart 1* in Appendix F.1 Competency Determination Rate Charts 1 and 2 shows the percentage of students with disabilities who earned a CD on their first attempt, and the cumulative percent of students with disabilities who earned a CD over the six re-test opportunities. As evidenced by this graph, the CD rate for students with disabilities is improving in each graduating class. As students in these classes who have not yet earned a CD take the available re-test opportunities, the CD rates should continue to improve.

The *Chart 2* in Appendix F.1 Competency Determination Rate Charts 1 and 2 shows the difference between the percent of students with disabilities earning a CD and the percent of non-disabled students earning a CD at each testing point for the classes of 2003, 2004, and 2005. As indicated in the graph, the cumulative CD rate "gap" between students with disabilities and non-disabled students decreases at each re-testing opportunity, and also decreases over each year. This indicates that students with disabilities are moving toward the goal of graduating at a rate comparable to that of non-disabled students.

(Note: Competency Determination data was reported as of June 2004. Students still had the summer retest opportunities remaining. With the retest, the CD rates will increase for the Class of 2004.)

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

Maintain target.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

MASSDE will continue to closely analyze dropout and graduate data, and will disseminate information as it becomes available regarding methods of closing the rate of dropout gap completely between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. MASSDE does not currently and will not report graduation rates for any student groups in FY05 or for any previous years. At its December 2002 meeting, the Massachusetts Board of Education approved modifying the Massachusetts School and District Accountability System to include graduation rates as an additional performance indicator for high schools. MASSDE will begin reporting graduation rates using the NCLB definition in the 2005-06 school year, using Student Information Management System (SIMS) data. In the interim, the competency determination (CD) rate for graduation will be utilized.

The graduation rate for Class of 2006 will be calculated as:

Graduates (with regular diploma who completed high school in four years) **DIVIDED BY** [# Graduates (same as above) + # of 9th grade dropouts/retentions + # 10th grade dropouts/retentions + # 11th grade dropout/retentions + # 12th grade dropouts/retentions + # students who completed 12th grade without a regular diploma.

The data for each class will be tracked going forward from 9th grade. Students who are retained in grade, and thus leave their original class, will not count toward the number of graduates, but will be included in the denominator as members of the original class.

Probe: BF. III

<i>Probes (2003-04)</i>	<i>Performance Indicators (2003-04)</i>
BF.III Are suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities comparable among local educational agencies within the State, or to the rates for non-disabled children within the agencies?	E. As indicated by the student suspension/exclusion data, suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities are comparable among local educational agencies within the State and to the rates for non-disabled children within the agencies.

Performance Indicator E

<i>Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)</i>	<i>Targets (2003-04)</i>	<i>Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)</i>																				
<p>E. SUSPENSION/EXPULSION</p> <p>Figure 4 Suspension/Expulsion data, ages 3-21 enrolled as of October 1, 2003 (source: Violence or Drug-Related Incidents and Student Discipline Report)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%;">Unduplicated Count of Children (Suspensions/Expulsions > 10 Days)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Number of Single (Suspensions/Expulsions > 10 Days)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Number of Multiple (Suspensions/Expulsions Summing > 10 Days)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Total Students Enrolled</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">SPED</td> <td style="text-align: center;">393</td> <td style="text-align: center;">428</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,600</td> <td style="text-align: center;">154,391</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Non-Disabled</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,217</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,279</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,913</td> <td style="text-align: center;">837,087</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">All Students</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,610</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,707</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3,513</td> <td style="text-align: center;">991,478</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Unduplicated Count of Children (Suspensions/Expulsions > 10 Days)	Number of Single (Suspensions/Expulsions > 10 Days)	Number of Multiple (Suspensions/Expulsions Summing > 10 Days)	Total Students Enrolled	SPED	393	428	1,600	154,391	Non-Disabled	1,217	1,279	1,913	837,087	All Students	1,610	1,707	3,513	991,478	<p style="text-align: center;">*</p> <p>E. SUSPENSION/EXPULSION</p> <p>The suspension and expulsion rate for students with disabilities will be no higher than for students without disabilities.</p>	<p>E. SUSPENSION/EXPULSION</p> <p>FY04 represents baseline data on suspensions and expulsions. In FY04, the aggregated collection of suspension and expulsion data for students with disabilities was eliminated, and the data was incorporated into a newly developed student-level electronic submission with two tiers called <i>Violence or Drug-Related Incidents</i> (Appendix E.1 Violence or Drug-Related Incidents) and <i>Student Discipline Records</i> (Appendix E.2 Student Discipline Report). This change allowed MASSDE to compare various aspects of the suspension/expulsion of both students with disabilities and general education students utilizing the same data source. In addition, MASSDE is now able to link the data to SIMS and verify data more effectively whereas the aggregate collection could not be validated to ensure validity. In addition, the districts now submit discipline data throughout the year.</p> <p>The SPED enrollment increased from 150,551 in 2002-2003 to 154,391 in 2003-2004 and overall student enrollment decreased from 993,463 in 2002-2003 to 991,478 in 2003-2004. According to the data in Figure 5, the number of single suspensions greater than 10 days for SPED and non-disabled students has decreased and the rate has decreased for the 2003-2004 school year.</p> <p>Additionally, Figure 6 presents MASSDE's initial analysis of LEA-level data to compare the rate at which each district is suspending or expelling students with disabilities to the rate at which each district is suspending or expelling non-disabled students. The data indicates there are 92 districts where the sped rate for students with suspensions greater than 10 days is higher than the rate for non-disabled students in the district. Of the 92 districts, six districts are found to have a difference in disabled and non-disabled rates more than 10 per</p>
	Unduplicated Count of Children (Suspensions/Expulsions > 10 Days)	Number of Single (Suspensions/Expulsions > 10 Days)	Number of Multiple (Suspensions/Expulsions Summing > 10 Days)	Total Students Enrolled																		
SPED	393	428	1,600	154,391																		
Non-Disabled	1,217	1,279	1,913	837,087																		
All Students	1,610	1,707	3,513	991,478																		

Figure 5
2003 and 2004 comparison of Unduplicated Count of Children (source: Violence or Drug-Related Incidents and Student Discipline Report)

	2003 Number of Single Suspensions/ Expulsions > 10 Days	2004 Number of Single Suspensions/ Expulsions > 10 Days	2003 Rate Per 1,000 Students Enrolled	2004 Rate Per 1,000 Students Enrolled
SPED	510	428	3.6	2.8
Non-Disabled	1,445	1,279	1.7	1.5
All Students	1,955	1,707	2.0	1.7

Figure 6
LEA suspension/expulsion data for students receiving out-of-school suspensions (expulsions) > 10 days. The rates include those disabled or non-disabled students in each district with more than 10 days suspension.

# LEAs Where Disabled Rate > Non-Disabled Rate	# LEAs Where Difference Between Disabled and Non-Disabled Rate is Greater than 10 per 1,000 Students Enrolled
92	6

1,000 enrolled students. While this represents the first time that MASSDE has conducted suspension/expulsion analysis in this manner, it should be noted that MASSDE continues to monitor LEA data and compliance regarding the suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities through the Coordinated Program Review System and through the Special Education Focused Monitoring system (see [Appendix A.1 Public School Coordinated Program Review System](#) and [Appendix A.6 Special Education Focused Monitoring: Pilot Procedures](#)).

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets
Maintain target.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

MASSDE, through the Program Quality Assurance, Data Collection and Reporting, and Special Education Planning and Policy units, will utilize student-level data collected through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) to develop comprehensive data reports for each district being monitored through the Coordinated Program Review (CPR) system in FY05. These reports include suspension/expulsion data, and MASSDE will invest resources into training CPR team members to use the data reports to guide the review process and the development of corrective action plans.

As indicated in the FY05 Continuous Improvement Plan, MASSDE will continue to be engaged in significant development activities aimed at building capacity in Massachusetts to better serve students with significant mental health issues. Activities will focus on awareness activities, school-wide prevention models and an interagency project for students with serious emotional disturbance. (see [Appendix B.2 Continuous Improvement Plan \(CIP\) – FY05](#))

Probe: BF. IV

Probes (2003-04)	Performance Indicators (2003-04)
BF.IV Do performance results for children with disabilities on large-scale assessments improve at a rate that decreases any gap between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers?	F. Using results from the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), students with disabilities in school districts will close the performance gap and achieve at a similar level as students without disabilities in tested academic areas.

Performance Indicator F

Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)	Targets (2003-04)																																																																																
<p>F. See Attachment 3 for Assessment Analysis</p> <p>PARTICIPATION AND ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP) <i>Figure 7: 2004 Adequate Yearly Progress Report: English/Language Arts</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #D3D3D3;"> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Participation</th> <th colspan="2">Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Improvement</th> <th colspan="2">Attendance</th> <th>Made AYP</th> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #D3D3D3;"> <th></th> <th>%</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>CPI</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>CPI Change</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>%</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>2004</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr style="background-color: #FFFF00;"> <td>Sped</td> <td>99</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>64.2</td> <td>No</td> <td>5.1</td> <td>No</td> <td>92.4</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #FFFF00;"> <td>All Students</td> <td>100</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>83.7</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>94.1</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Figure 8: 2004 Adequate Yearly Progress Report: Mathematics</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #D3D3D3;"> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Participation</th> <th colspan="2">Performance</th> <th colspan="2">Improvement</th> <th colspan="2">Attendance</th> <th>Made AYP</th> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #D3D3D3;"> <th></th> <th>%</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>CPI</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>CPI Change</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>%</th> <th>Met Target</th> <th>2004</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr style="background-color: #FFFF00;"> <td>Sped</td> <td>99</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>47</td> <td>No</td> <td>5.1</td> <td>No</td> <td>92.4</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr style="background-color: #FFFF00;"> <td>All Students</td> <td>100</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>70.4</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>5.2</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>94.1</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Participation		Performance		Improvement		Attendance		Made AYP		%	Met Target	CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	%	Met Target	2004	Sped	99	Yes	64.2	No	5.1	No	92.4	Yes	No	All Students	100	Yes	83.7	Yes	3.3	Yes	94.1	Yes	Yes		Participation		Performance		Improvement		Attendance		Made AYP		%	Met Target	CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	%	Met Target	2004	Sped	99	Yes	47	No	5.1	No	92.4	Yes	No	All Students	100	Yes	70.4	Yes	5.2	Yes	94.1	Yes	Yes	<p style="text-align: center;">*</p> <p>F.</p> <p>PARTICIPATION At least 95 percent of students with disabilities will participate in MCAS or Alternate Assessments.</p> <p>ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP) Students with disabilities will make continued progress toward the overall NCLB goal of reaching 100% proficiency, as measured through the Special Education subgroup making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics.</p> <p>See Appendix F.2 School Leaders' Guide to the 2004 Cycle III Accountability and AYP Reports for details on the AYP determination process.</p>
	Participation		Performance		Improvement		Attendance		Made AYP																																																																								
	%	Met Target	CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	%	Met Target	2004																																																																								
Sped	99	Yes	64.2	No	5.1	No	92.4	Yes	No																																																																								
All Students	100	Yes	83.7	Yes	3.3	Yes	94.1	Yes	Yes																																																																								
	Participation		Performance		Improvement		Attendance		Made AYP																																																																								
	%	Met Target	CPI	Met Target	CPI Change	Met Target	%	Met Target	2004																																																																								
Sped	99	Yes	47	No	5.1	No	92.4	Yes	No																																																																								
All Students	100	Yes	70.4	Yes	5.2	Yes	94.1	Yes	Yes																																																																								

ASSOCIATED COMPLIANCE DATA**Appendix B.1 Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) – FY04****CIP 2.1 -- Special Education and Related Services are Identified and Provided and IEPs are Current
CPR AND MID-CYCLE RESULTS FOR SE 22#1, SE22#2, SE22#4, SE18A#1, SE18A#6, and SE18B#5: FY01 – FY04**

SE22#2: At the beginning of each school year, the district has an IEP in effect for each eligible student within its jurisdiction.

SE 22#2	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Commendable/ Implemented	93%	86%	84%	90%
Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	7%	14%	16%	10%
Total Sites	56	49	51	52

MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04

Of the four LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for SE22#2 in FY01, all four (100%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.

SE22#1: Where the IEP of the student in need of special education has been accepted in whole or in part by that student's parent, the school district provides the mutually agreed upon services without delay.

SE 22#1	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Commendable/ Implemented	93%	88%	80%	83%
Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	7%	12%	10%	17%
Total Sites	56	49	51	52

MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04

Of the four LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for SE22#1 in FY01, all four (100%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.

SE22#4: The school district does not delay implementation of the IEP due to lack of classroom space or personnel, provides as many of the services on the accepted IEP as possible, and immediately informs parents in writing of any delayed services, reasons for delay, actions that the school district is taking to address the lack of space or personnel and offers alternative methods to meet the goals of the accepted IEP. Upon agreement of the parents, the school district implements alternative methods immediately until the lack of space or personnel issues are resolved.

SE 22#4	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Commendable/ Implemented	86%	88%	76%	92%
Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	14%	12%	24%	8%
Total Sites	56	49	51	52

MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04

Of the eight LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for SE22#4 in FY01, all eight (100%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.

SE18A#1: Upon determining that the student is eligible for special education, the Team, including the parent(s), develops an IEP using the evaluation data to guide development of measurable, annual goals and objectives/benchmarks for the student. If the district chooses to draft any element(s) of the IEP for discussion, the Team Chairperson ensures that those elements are genuinely considered prior to adoption at the Team meeting. All ideas and needs of the child as expressed by all Team members, especially the parents, are genuinely considered by the district prior to proposing the IEP.

SE 18A#1	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Commendable/ Implemented	88%	59%	63%	52%
Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	12%	41%	37%	48%
Total Sites	56	49	51	52

MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04

Of the seven LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for SE18A#1 in FY01, five (71%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.

SE18A#6: The school district ensures that each IEP Team has at least one person with authority to commit the resources of the district and that whatever services are set out in the IEP will actually be provided and that the IEP will not be changed at a higher administrative level within the district.

SE 18A#6	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Commendable/ Implemented	80%	73%	43%	63%
Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	20%	27%	57%	37%
Total Sites	56	49	49	52

MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04

Of the 11 LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for SE18A#6 in FY01, all 11 (100%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.

SE18B#5: Immediately following the development of the IEP, and within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or reevaluation, the district provides the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the required notice, except that the proposal of placement may be delayed according to the provisions of 603 CMR 28.06(2)(e) in a limited number of cases.

SE 18B#5	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04
Commendable/ Implemented	70%	55%	37%	44%
Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	30%	45%	63%	56%
Total Sites	56	49	51	52

MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04

Of the 17 LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for SE18B#5 in FY01, 12 (71%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)

F. PARTICIPATION

Beginning in school year 2002-03, MASSDE requires that all publicly funded students, including those students with disabilities, participate in the grade level Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) test. Although the participation requirement is the same for general education students, students with disabilities can participate in either the standard MCAS or, the MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt), depending on the nature and complexity of their disability. The MCAS-Alt is a portfolio-based assessment that measures a student's knowledge of the key concepts and skills outlined in the learning standards of the Massachusetts *Curriculum Frameworks*.

To assist teachers in providing students with significant disabilities access to the general curriculum and to ensure that the MCAS-Alt process is conducted effectively, MASSDE made available multiple technical assistance documents and provided many training sessions throughout the school year.

In accordance with the mandates of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), MASSDE has set biennial performance targets for all schools and the federally mandated subgroups. These targets help ensure that schools and subgroups are on track to meet the federal goal of all students achieving proficiency by the year 2014. In school year 2003-04, a 95 percent minimum participation rate in the state assessment program was required. Massachusetts exceeded the state and federal goal of participation with ninety-nine percent of all students with disabilities participating in the MCAS or MCAS-Alt.

ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP)

In addition to requiring all students to participate in MCAS or MCAS-Alt, MASSDE requires that each district receive a positive Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determination each year. In school year 2003-04, AYP was designed by MASSDE to monitor the progress of the public schools toward meeting the goal of high achievement for all students. AYP measures elements of participation, performance, improvement, and attendance to determine if schools are meeting the yearly target that aligns with the overarching goal of all students being proficient by school year 2014.

The targets for all student subgroups are the same in Massachusetts in that each subgroup is held to the same level of expectation and the same participation and achievement standards. In order to achieve AYP in school year 2003-04, a student subgroup must have first met a student participation requirement of 95 percent or greater. Next, the subgroup had to either meet the State's Cycle III performance target, a Composite Performance Index (CPI) score of 75.6 for English/Language Arts (ELA) and 60.8 for Math, or the subgroup had to meet their Cycle III improvement target plus an attendance target (see [Appendix F.2 School Leaders' Guide to the 2004 Cycle III Accountability and AYP Reports](#) for details on the AYP determination process).

As detailed in *Figures 8 and 9*, while students with disabilities met both the participation and attendance targets, the subgroup did not make AYP in English Language Arts (ELA) or Mathematics as a result of reaching neither the performance nor the improvement targets. By comparison, the state's aggregate results for all students (which includes students with disabilities and non-disabled students) showed that AYP was achieved and the targets were met in each of the four target areas for both ELA and Mathematics. Despite not making AYP for the special education subgroup, there are positive indicators that students with disabilities are closing the performance gap with non-disabled students. Students with disabilities demonstrated greater improvement in ELA performance from 2003 (a CPI increase of 1.0) than did the aggregate total of all students (a CPI increase of 0.6), and the improvement gains in mathematics were equal for both the special education subgroup and the aggregate total of all students (a CPI increase of 1.1 for both groups). Additionally, MCAS results for students with disabilities continue to improve as schools review the results of prior years and work to target and improve instruction for students who need assistance. Students with disabilities improved their performance in several subjects, with the largest improvements in Mathematics in grades 8 and 10. In 2004, the percentage of students with disabilities performing at the *Proficient* and *Advanced* levels in Mathematics increased by two percentage points at both grades 8 and 10. At the same time, the percentage of students with disabilities who performed at the *Warning/Failing* level declined in grade 8 by six percentage points, and in grade 10 by seven percentage points. Finally, the Competency Determination (CD) rate data presented in Probe BF. II in this cluster area and in [Appendix F.1 Competency Determination Rate Charts 1 and 2](#) serve as further evidence that the achievement gap between students with disabilities and non-disabled students is growing smaller.

In order to meet the goal of students with disabilities achieving proficiency, MASSDE works with districts and schools to analyze student assessment data and implement effective improvement plans. In addition, best practices from schools winning the Compass awards are disseminated and shared with all low performing districts. Each district and school in

Massachusetts was provided with their Cycle III AYP results detailing outcomes for each subgroup and assistance was provided by MASSDE to assist districts in determining areas of needed improvement and how that improvement could be achieved. In addition to the AYP results, districts and schools also received detailed MCAS item-analysis charts to facilitate in determining patterns, identify weakness and relevant relationships across student subgroups, performance levels, and subject areas and inform staff professional development.

ASSOCIATED COMPLIANCE DATA

CIP 2.1 – Special Education and Related Services are Identified and Provided and IEPs are Current

The requirements in this area focus on ensuring that LEAs conduct IEP meetings at least annually. Data from the Coordinated Program Reviews (CPR) conducted by MASSDE through the Program Quality Assurance unit (PQA) are used to monitor this area through a number of criteria. SE22#2 is the focus indicator and relates to the currency of every student's IEP at the beginning of the school year. While data in this area demonstrates consistently high levels of compliance, the associated areas have compliance levels that vary greatly. As a result, MASSDE considers this a key area and it will remain a part of the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP).

Note: It is important to note that MASSDE is now able to compare cohort groups by reviewing the mid-cycle data as compared to the CPR data. With the first year of Mid-cycle Reviews completed, MASSDE is able to effectively ensure that noncompliance identified during the FY01 CPRs has been corrected. For the LEAs that remained noncompliant with SE18A#1 and SE18B#, MASSDE prescribed corrective action. The LEAs must implement this corrective action without delay or face possible loss of funds to the district and/or other enforcement action by MASSDE. CPR data cohorts will begin comparability as of FY07.

CIP 2.3 – Opportunity to Progress in the General Curriculum

In past years, MASSDE has measured this priority area primarily through compliance data. In June 2003, the State Special Education Steering Committee determined that review of this area would focus on student outcome data, including MCAS performance data for students with disabilities disaggregated to consider disability specific information and placement information. During FY04, MASSDE reviewed preliminary outcome data disaggregated by disability and presented this data to key stakeholders. Although no compelling trends were identified, the review of outcome data in this manner clearly points to the directions of our future activities (see Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources below).

Note: In response to the OSEP FFY2002 APR Letter (11/2004), MASSDE provided additional detail on ensuring compliance with SE18A#1, SE 18A#2, and SE49. See [Appendix C.1 Response Letter to OSEP Findings on FFY2002 APR \(section 4\)](#).

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

The same targets will be in place for 2004-05.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

MASSDE, through Assessment & Accountability and Targeted Assistance staff time, will continue in school year 2004-05 toward the overall target of 100 percent proficiency for all students by 2014.

MASSDE will continue to evaluate schools and districts utilizing the AYP determination system (See [Appendix F.2 School Leaders' Guide to the 2003 Mid-Cycle AYP Reports](#) for details on the AYP determination process), and will consistently identify under-performing schools, conduct fact-finding reviews to determine under-performing causes, and assist schools in developing school improvement plans.

CIP 2.1 – Special Education and Related Services are Identified and Provided and IEPs are Current will remain a priority area for FY05 (see [Appendix B.2 Continuous Improvement Plan \(CIP\) – FY05](#)). In response to the Steering Committee, MASSDE will add *SE28: Parent provided IEP or notice along with procedural safeguards and parents rights* as an area to be more closely monitored. Additionally, the Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office will:

- Work to provide training and technical assistance on the roles of Team members and spirit of these requirements.
- Explore options for the development of models for writing appropriate and efficient IEPs that do not sacrifice individualized focus.
- Explore options for reducing the paperwork burden placed on service providers.

CIP 2.3 – Opportunity to Progress in the General Curriculum will remain a priority area for FY05 (see [Appendix B.2 Continuous Improvement Plan \(CIP\) – FY05](#)). As identified in the FY05 CIP, MASSDE will:

- Continue to analyze outcome data by looking at factors related to performance, such as: placement, school district size, income level, and performance by disability.
- Work with the Assessment and Accountability and Targeted Assistance staff to include special education assessment data in the TestWiz software program. This program allows schools and districts to conduct detailed item analysis of student assessment data in order to more effectively plan for improved student results.
- Identify district or school-based professional development models that support strong achievement of students with disabilities.
- Provide professional development opportunities for parents and medical community members on how placement in the least restrictive environment can contribute to better outcomes.
- More closely examine performance results of students in out-of-district placements.
- Explore opportunities for providing small grants to higher education institutions to encourage research projects on the performance of students with disabilities.

CIP 2.4 – Special Requirements for Determination of Specific Learning Disabilities is a new CIP item and has been identified as a priority area for FY05 (see [Appendix B.2 Continuous Improvement Plan \(CIP\) – FY05](#)). As identified in the FY05 CIP, MASSDE will consider the impact of new IDEA statutory language regarding SLD and:

- Provide practical guidelines on each of the specific requirements for SLD.
- Convene a working group to study ways to ensure more consistency of practice in eligibility determinations.
- Explore “response to intervention” models.
- Help schools develop capacity to provide tiered reading interventions.
- Obtain and analyze data related to the presenting issues of students coming to building-based support teams or being referred for eligibility determinations.

Probe: BF. V

<i>Probes (2003-04)</i>	<i>Performance Indicators (2003-04)</i>
BF.V Are children with disabilities educated with non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate, including preschool?	H. Through placement information obtained from SIMS data and monitoring, children with disabilities are educated with non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate, including preschool.
	I. LEAs provide a full range of placement options depending on the individual needs of the student, and removal occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in the general education environment with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

Performance Indicator H

Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)	Targets (2003-04)	Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)
<p>H. PLACEMENT</p> <p>See Appendix G Longitudinal Placement Data – Special Education Data FY91 to FY05 for longitudinal data on placement: school year 1990-91 to school year 2004-05.</p>	<p>H. PLACEMENT</p> <p>There is a higher percent of students with disabilities in less restrictive settings.</p>	<p>H. PLACEMENT</p> <p>As identified through OSEP’s rankings for LRE (Table 5.2), and noted in OSEP’s Data Verification Letter (10/04), Massachusetts’s performance in the least restrictive environment for FY03 was not accurate because Massachusetts utilized definitions that varied from federal definitions of educational environment/placement. In FY03, MASSDE evaluated the current collection of placement information and determined appropriate categories and definitions to be implemented in FY04. See <i>Explanation of Progress and Slippage</i> in Cluster I, Probe: GS. V, Performance Indicator E for a detailed explanation of changes to the placement categories and data collection methods.</p> <p>Since FY04 was the first year in which the Educational Environment (Placement) categories corresponded to federal definitions, the data presented for FY04 (Appendix G Longitudinal Placement Data – Special Education Data FY91 to FY05) is not yet fully representative of the educational environments of students with disabilities in Massachusetts. However, the increase in the “Full Inclusion” category from 11.7% in FY03 to 36.3% in FY04 and 45.7% in FY05 indicates that the changes made to the data collection system and definitions are beginning to provide more reliable and accurate placement data. MASSDE expects the percentage of students in the “Full Inclusion” category to continue increasing as LEAs become more familiar with the new categories and definitions.</p>

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

Target will remain the same.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

MASSDE will continue to design additional SIMS validations, and provide multiple training sessions, detailed web-based documentation, and increased technical assistance to ensure more accurate reporting regarding Educational Environment data.

As indicated in the FY05 Continuous Improvement Plan, MASSDE will continue to review educational environment data by disability and by performance as a means critical next step for this area. (see [Appendix B.2 Continuous Improvement Plan \(CIP\) – FY05](#) and **Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources** for Performance Indicator I immediately below).

Performance Indicator I

Baseline/Trend Data (2003-04)	Targets (2003-04)	Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-04)																				
<p>i.</p> <p>CIP 2.2 – LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>CPR AND MID-CYCLE RESULTS FOR SE 20: FY01 – FY04</p> <p><i>SE20: Least Restrictive Program Selected</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="86 492 739 675"> <thead> <tr> <th>SE 20</th> <th>FY01</th> <th>FY02</th> <th>FY03</th> <th>FY04</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Commendable/ Implemented</td> <td>80%</td> <td>61%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented</td> <td>20%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Sites</td> <td>56</td> <td>49</td> <td>51</td> <td>51</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>MID-CYCLE REVIEW FY 04 <i>Of the 11 LEAs that were found partially or not implemented for SE20 in FY01, nine (82%) were found 'Commendable/Implemented' by the following mid-cycle review.</i></p>	SE 20	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	Commendable/ Implemented	80%	61%	71%	61%	Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	20%	39%	29%	39%	Total Sites	56	49	51	51	<p>i.</p> <p>CIP 2.2 – LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>LEAs provide a full range of placement options depending on the individual needs of the student, and removal occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in the general education environment with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.</p> <p>Compliance data for area should be 93% or better compliance rate for two consecutive years.</p>	<p>i.</p> <p>CIP 2.2 – LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>CPR AND MID-CYCLE RESULTS FOR SE20: FY01 – FY04</p> <p>Data from the Coordinated Program Reviews (CPR) conducted by MASSDE through the Program Quality Assurance unit (PQA) for FY04 indicates that 61% of districts monitored were found “Commendable or Implemented”.</p> <p>It is important to note that MASSDE is now able to compare cohort groups by reviewing the mid-cycle data as compared to the CPR data. With the first year of Mid-cycle Reviews completed, MASSDE is able to effectively ensure that noncompliance identified during the FY01 CPRs has been corrected. For the two LEAs that remained noncompliant with SE20, MASSDE prescribed corrective action. The LEA must implement this corrective action without delay or face possible loss of funds to the district and/or other enforcement action by MASSDE. CPR data cohorts will begin comparability as of FY07.</p> <p>Although the mid-cycle review data shows high rates of corrected noncompliance, the compliance rates for SE20 have not reached the target of 93% for two consecutive years, and will remain a CIP area for FY05. In FY04, MASSDE began reviewing placement data by disability and performance as a critical next step for this CIP area. While the analysis is not yet complete, MASSDE will continue this process in FY05.</p> <p>Additionally, in response to the OSEP FFY2002 APR Letter (11/2004), MASSDE provided additional detail on ensuring compliance with SE20. See Appendix C.1 Response Letter to OSEP Findings on FFY2002 APR (section 5).</p>
SE 20	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04																		
Commendable/ Implemented	80%	61%	71%	61%																		
Partially Implemented/ Not Implemented	20%	39%	29%	39%																		
Total Sites	56	49	51	51																		

	<p><i>SE20= Least Restrictive Program Selected:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program selected is the least restrictive environment for students, with consideration given to any potential harmful effect on the student or on the quality of services that he or she needs. 2. If the student is removed from the general education classroom at any time, the Team states why the removal is considered critical to the student's program and the basis for its conclusion that education of the student in a less restrictive environment, with the use of supplementary aids and services, could not be achieved satisfactorily. 3. The district does not remove an eligible child from the general education classroom solely because of needed modification in the curriculum. 4. If a student's IEP necessitates special education services in a day or residential facility or an out-of-district educational collaborative program, the IEP Team considers whether the student requires special education services and support to promote the student's transition to placement in a less restrictive environment. <p>State Regulations 28.06(2)(a); Chapter 71B, section 3</p> <p>Federal Requirements 34 CFR 300.330; 300.550-300.556</p>
--	--

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

Targets remain the same.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

MASSDE, through Program Quality Assurance staff time, will continue procedural compliance activity through ongoing CPR schedule. CPR team members will utilize comprehensive data reports for each district being monitored through the Coordinated Program Review (CPR) system in FY05. These reports will include detailed placement data, and MASSDE will invest resources into training CPR team members to use the data reports to guide the review process and the development of corrective action plans.

CIP 2.2 – Least Restrictive Environment will remain on the FY05 CIP (see [Appendix B.2 Continuous Improvement Plan \(CIP\) – FY05](#)). As identified in the FY05 CIP, MASSDE will:

- Continue to review educational environment data by disability and by performance as a means critical next step for this area.

- Explore ways in which incentives can be used to promote increased use of less restrictive placements.
- Work to develop a Least Restrictive Environment guide or self-assessment tool.
- Determine if the Circuit Breaker reimbursement program can be used to promote the use of less restrictive placements.

Through a detailed analysis of monitoring data from Coordinated Program Reviews, the State Special Education Steering Committee also recommended activities in the following compliance areas as resources allow (see [Appendix B.2 Continuous Improvement Plan \(CIP\) – FY05](#)):

- Progress reports and content (SE13)
- Responsibilities of the school principal and administrator of Special Education (SE50)
- Professional development in special education (SE54)
- Special education programs and services are evaluated (SE56)

Probe: BF. VI

<i>Probes (2003-2004)</i>	<i>Performance Indicators (2003-2004)</i>
BF.VI Are the early language/communication, pre-reading, and social-emotional skills of preschool children with disabilities receiving special education and related services, improving?	J. The early language/communication, pre-reading, and social-emotional skills of preschool children with disabilities receiving special education and related services demonstrate improvement.

Performance Indicator J

<i>Baseline/Trend Data (2003-2004)</i>	<i>Targets (2003-2004)</i>	<i>Explanation of Progress or Slippage (2003-2004)</i>
J. There is currently no baseline/trend data available.	J. A kindergarten readiness assessment system will be completed by June 30, 2006 and the program will be piloted beginning in September 2007	J. During state fiscal year 2006, the programs administered by Early Learning Services (ELS), currently at the Department of Education (MASSDE), will be moved to a newly created Department of Early Education and Care (DEEC), including the staff charged with implementation of Section 619 of Part B of IDEA. The Department of Education will continue to be the lead agency for IDEA and monitor all special education programs. MASSDE will develop an interagency agreement with DEEC in order to ensure that all early childhood policies and programs in the Commonwealth support the inclusion of young children with disabilities. DEEC will operate at the direction of a new Board of Early Education and Care. The Board was recently named and charged to “oversee the

		<p>development and implementation of a high-quality system of public and private early education and care. The board shall oversee the development and implementation of a program of voluntary, universal accessible high-quality early childhood education to all preschool-aged children in the Commonwealth, subject to appropriation. The Board shall oversee the development and management of an educationally sound kindergarten readiness assessment for pre-school children and a comprehensive evaluation of early education and care programs.”</p> <p>Next year will be the year in which the new Board of DEEC will oversee the development of the kindergarten readiness assessment for pre-school children. Section 619 staff transferred to the new agency will work to ensure that the new kindergarten readiness assessment is appropriate for all children, including those with disabilities and that any piloting includes children with disabilities. The interagency agreement between MASSDE and DEEC will identify the inclusion of young children with disabilities in the development of all policies and programs for young children as a priority. MASSDE will be consulted at each step of the way as plans for the new kindergarten readiness assessment are developed.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the kindergarten readiness assessment system will be completed by June 30, 2006 and the program will be piloted beginning in September 2007.</p>
--	--	---

Projected Targets, Activities, Timelines, and Resources (2004-05)

Projected Targets

See information provided above.

Projected Activities, Timelines, and Resources

See information provided above.