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U.S Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
Potomac Center Plaza
Mail Stop 2600, Room 4166
550 12th Street S.W.
Washington, DC 20202

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL: OSERS.bapr@ed.gov

Re: Massachusetts Part B Annual Performance Report (MA APR) and for FFY 2010 and Revised Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan (MA SPP)

Dear Sir or Madam:

On behalf of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MASSDE), I have enclosed the Massachusetts Annual Performance Report (MA APR) for FFY2010, and a revised copy of the Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan (MA SPP). The MA APR responds directly to the instructions included in Information Collection 1820-0624, Part B State Performance Plan (Part B-SPP) and Annual Performance Report (Part B-APR), and OSEP Memorandum 12-4, submitted to states on November 28, 2011. The MA APR contains actual target data from the FFY2010 reporting period and other responsive APR information for Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4A, 4B, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. The APR also contains information responsive to the areas identified in the Massachusetts Part B FFY2009 SPP/APR Letter and Response Table. Improvement activities, timelines, or resources have been updated throughout the APR and SPP. The revised MA SPP also includes updated descriptive information about agency processes and procedures for Indicators 4B, 8, and 13, based on instruction from OSEP and/or revisions to systems and narratives initiated by MASSDE.

MASSDE appreciates the opportunity to make corrections to the report submitted on February 1, 2012. In its revised FFY2010 APR, MASSDE has made changes to data and discussion that it identified, and also addressed issues identified by OSEP in the Massachusetts Part B FFY2010 SPP/APR Status Table. Following is a list of edits that are included in this revised submission:

- Indicator 3: updated hyperlink (page 20),
- Indicator 4: clarified the reporting and data collection periods and updated actual data following additional review and verification activities (pages 28, 29, 31-33),
- Indicator 5: corrected inconsistency in reporting total number of IEP students used in the calculation. OSEP also requested an explanation of the inconsistency between the Indicator 5C data and the State’s reported 618 data. That explanation was included in the original indicator report, and can be found here at page 43.
- Indicator 7: updated actual data following additional verification activities, and corrections to inconsistencies in designation of outcome categories corrected (pages 52-55),
- Indicator 8: updated actual data, related charts, graphs and discussion following data verification (pages 58-62),
- Indicator 11: clarified “school working day” language, and updated identification of noncompliance activities (pages 75-76),
- Indicator 12: updated actual data; updated information about verification of correction of noncompliance activities (pages 79-81),
- Indicator 13: updated data following data verification and correction activities, and updated descriptions of verification of correction of noncompliance activities (pages 84-86),
- Indicator 14: updated data, charts, and graphs following receipt of additional data and data verification activities (pages 91-95),
- Indicator 15: updated data to reflect additional findings issued in FFY2009 for Indicator 12 (page 100-102); see also updated figures in Appendix E, Indicator 15 Worksheet (page 143 &145),
- Indicator 20: The compliance rate for Indicator 20 remains the same as the rate reported on February 1, 2012. All corrections identified in the status table have been made to the APR.
Page references in the table of contents have also been updated. Throughout the revised APR, deleted language is marked by a strikethrough and new language is underlined.

In FFY2010 and since the date of the last report to OSEP, MASSDE has continued to work with stakeholders including the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee, the Statewide Advisory Council, statewide advocacy groups and parent organizations, and other state and local agencies that share MASSDE’s priority for improving our work on behalf of children with disabilities, their families, and their educators. New and updated inter- and intra-agency initiatives have refined MASSDE’s data collection methods, technical assistance available to and resources provided for local education agencies (LEAs, or school districts), and methods for verifying correction of noncompliance, among other things. Each activity is designed to support improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Consistent with prior years’ public reporting efforts, the completed MA APR is made widely available for public review and discussion through interest group and advisory council meetings, other conferences and meetings throughout the year, and on the MASSDE website at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/. Also, MASSDE distributes copies of the report to key constituencies and to the media. Districts’ indicator data are publicly reported at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/special_ed.aspx; this information is being updated currently for FFY2010.

Please contact me at 781.338.3388 or mmmitnacht@doe.mass.edu, if you have any questions or if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Marcia Mittnacht
State Director of Special Education
Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office
Massachusetts Department of Education

C: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY (2009-2010 data)</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Target Data for FFY2010** (data and target from 2009-2010 as per instructions regarding a one year data lag):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Students in 2009-2010 cohort</th>
<th>Number of Students in 2009-2010 cohort who graduated in four years or less</th>
<th>2009-2010 Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,699</td>
<td>9,421</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE’s reported data and measurement is aligned with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and the state uses the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This report uses the most recent graduation data that MASSDE reports as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CPSR).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data):**

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage**

For this reporting year, **64.1%** of students with IEPs in the 2009-2010 cohort graduated from high school in four years or less. States’ reports are subject to a one year data lag, which requires reporting of actual target data for FFY2009 against the FFY2009 measurable and rigorous target. Therefore, this report uses the graduation data for students with IEPs from school year 2009-2010 and uses revised graduation rate targets approved by the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in December 2010. The Board adopted the targets of 95% percent for the statewide four-year graduation rate and 100% for the statewide five-year graduation rate for all students, to be achieved by 2018.

Although MASSDE is not required to report a five-year graduation rate, MASSDE regularly calculates this rate because a significant number of students with disabilities require more than four years to meet graduation standards. The five-year graduation rate for students with IEPs in 2009-2010 is 69.3%. Although this is a 0.3 percentage point decrease from the previous year, it is more than 5 percentage
points above the 4-year rate for the same period. MASSDE will continue to calculate and publicly report the five-year rate for subsequent cohorts as an additional measure of year-to-year progress for students with and without IEPs.

To receive a diploma from a Massachusetts public high school, a student must (1) earn a Competency Determination (i.e., achieve a specified level of proficiency on the Grade 10 English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, and beginning with the class of 2010, on the Science, Technology, and Engineering (STE) statewide assessments administered through the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), or on the MCAS-Alt), and (2) meet local graduation requirements. Students receiving a diploma in four years or less are counted as graduates for purposes of reporting these data in the Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR).

As noted in Graph 1 below, since school year 2005-2006 to a high of 64.9% in 2008-2009, the graduation rate for students with disabilities in Massachusetts increased from 61.1% to 64.9%. MASSDE is examining this year's decrease of 0.8 percentage points, and is exploring reasons for such a decline. The most likely cause of this slight slippage is the implementation of the new state requirement that all students must pass one of the MCAS STE tests, in addition to the ELA and Mathematics tests, to achieve a competency determination. MASSDE is also examining the preparation that students with disabilities receive prior to the taking the high stakes state assessments, and whether students in institutional settings have access to the tools and materials such as laboratory facilities necessary to master the subject material. Another area to be examined is whether there is any correlation between the general education graduation rate increase of 0.9 percentage points and the special education slippage of 0.8 percentage points during this same period.

Graph 1:

**Four Year Graduation Rate of Students with IEPs:**

*2005-2006 to 2009-2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Students with IEPs Graduating in Four Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Student Information Management System, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

**Improvement Activities**

During FFY2010, through its Student Support, Career, and Education Services unit (SSCE), the Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP), and the Center for School and District Accountability, MASSDE has engaged in the following improvement activities that directly support high school completion for students with IEPs. More information is included in Appendix A.
Massachusetts Bullying Prevention and Intervention Law: An Act Relative to Bullying in Schools was signed into law in May 2010. The law requires school leaders to create and implement strategies to prevent bullying and to address bullying and retaliation promptly and effectively. Among other measures, districts must create bullying prevention and intervention plans, provide supports for targets and aggressors, and adopt and implement age appropriate social emotional curricula. Additional provisions amend state special education law to require IEP Teams to address skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing for students with disabilities. These actions are intended to, among other things, address school environment issues that may lead to student attrition.

Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad). MASSDE identified 133 high schools with dropout rates higher than the state average of 2.9% as reported in 2008-2009. Through this award, MASSDE will help support 28 of the targeted schools in implementing a select menu of research and evidence-based practices through technical assistance, professional development, and learning exchanges that will allow for sharing of best practices. In addition, MASSDE will assist schools in a careful analysis of their at-risk students to strengthen strategic dropout prevention, intervention, and recovery approaches. Schools receiving funds must choose up to three strategies from a menu of research-based strategies to support and retain students through graduation. The strategies include:

1. alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs;
2. adult advocates for student support;
3. positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support;
4. service-learning and work-based learning models specifically targeting students most likely to not graduate;
5. credit recovery, credit acceleration, and distance learning through development of courses/modules, pilot implementation of courses/models, and training of staff;
6. expansion of the school year/structured learning time and summer transition programs;
7. programs and systems specifically designed to service transient students, including migrant students, English Language Learner (ELL) students, refugees, immigrants, and other newcomers.

The Dropout Prevention and Recovery Work Group (SSCE) was created as a result of The Graduation and Dropout Prevention and Recovery Commission Report – Making the Connection. The Commission was charged with examining current statewide policies and making recommendations on how to retain at-risk students. The focus of the Work Group is to support district team action planning and to facilitate the sharing of promising practices in order to prevent student dropout and consequently improve graduation rates. The MassGrad Initiative greatly expanded the Work Group by adding the 133 high schools in the state that met this criterion. A continuing practice is for three of the districts to host face-to-face meetings at their sites and demonstrate their promising programs, policies, and practices regarding attendance, discipline, homework, and related activities that show progress in retaining students with disabilities.

The Dropout Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Website (SSCE) includes an extensive collection of graduation and dropout prevention related news and trainings, articles/reports, and websites for students, parents, and educators.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) - IDEA. Activities funded through the ARRA-IDEA grant were to be designed to ensure that students with disabilities have access to a free and appropriate education (FAPE) by providing services and programs that met students' unique needs and prepared them for further education, employment, and independent living. Funds were to be used for 1) recovery purposes (to sustain and support existing special education programming), and 2) investment purposes (to improve educator quality and effectiveness; to support schools, districts, and students; for assessment and data; and to promote college and career readiness).
Many of the districts directed their ARRA allocations to new and/or expanded programs designed to improve school climates and create alternative strategies to suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs. They also allocated funds for credit recovery programs for students returning to school. Some examples of programs include:

- hiring consultants to evaluate their programs and practices regarding suspensions and expulsions and provide technical assistance for designing systemic changes to improve their programs and practices;
- collaborating with other districts to develop and implement programs, including credit recovery programs, virtual and other alternative high schools for students with behavior and/or emotional problems who have high rates of suspension and expulsions; and
- hiring support staff such as guidance counselors, school social workers, school adjustment counselors, with particular therapeutic and counseling skills for this population.

### The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Title II-D Technology Competitive Grant Program: Online Courses and Modules Grant for At-Risk High School Students.
Fourteen schools receive funding to work collaboratively with MASSDE to create, implement, and evaluate online courses/modules for underserved high school students in alternative education, credit recovery, or credit acceleration programs. Grant recipients include a variety of educational settings: alternative programs and schools, vocational-technical high schools, comprehensive high schools and educational collaborative. The online courses/modules are developed to align with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks or the Massachusetts High School Program of Studies (MassCore). It is anticipated that there will be over 100 courses/modules created, all of which will be co-owned with MASSDE. MASSDE will create a library of courses/modules to make available to schools and districts state-wide.

### Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools
is an interagency initiative of the Commonwealth’s Executive Office of Health and Human Services. Its mission is to strengthen, expand and integrate Massachusetts state services into a comprehensive, community-based system of care to ensure that families and their children with significant behavioral, emotional and mental health needs obtain the services necessary for success in home, schools and community. These wraparound services provide substantial and specific supports to students who are at high risk for dropping out of school, and to students who have already dropped out and need assistance in returning to school. The Task Force’s [final report](#) was issued in August 2011.

### In partnership with the Central Massachusetts Communities of Care (CCMC) Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS) Grant (SEPP), MASSDE provided grant funds to support districts in Worcester County with the development and implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and “wrap-around” mental health services and supports, for which students at risk for dropping out or those returning to school are eligible. The participating districts receive professional development as well as onsite assistance in the development and implementation of the principles of PBIS. In the first year of the program, four districts totaling six schools and over 50 school personnel (including teachers, administrators, related service providers, paraprofessional, parents, and students) participated. In the second year, this first cohort of districts moved from the planning stage to implementation, and the second cohort of six districts entered the first stage. In the third year of the grant, the second cohort completed the implementation stage, and a third cohort of four districts and six schools began the initial, planning stage. The districts that completed implementation reported significant improvement in the type and scope of non-academic supports for students, increased success for struggling students, and improved school culture.

### Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA) (SEPP) provides online, graduate level coursework to middle and high school educators across the state. Two content areas, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction, focus on ways to support all students, but
especially those with disabilities. The courses enable educators to gain a better understanding of how disabilities affect student learning and behavior, and provide educators with improved skills in the areas of curriculum design, instruction, evaluation, and technology. These skills translate into improved student outcomes, which will lead to decreased dropout rates. Additional MFA courses that positively affect student success and promote decreased dropout rates include Positive Behavioral Supports, Collaborative Teaching, Family Engagement, and Postsecondary Transition.

- **National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Professional Development Series (SEPP).** The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), with support from the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN), provides the NASDSE Professional Development Series. These telecasts bring nationally recognized experts to the Commonwealth using technology, providing an affordable means of quality personnel development for a variety of stakeholders. In 2009-2010, series topics were: *Seclusion and Restraint the Impact of Federal and State Policy in the Classroom; Healthy, Physically Fit and Ready for Action: Addressing Physical Education and Activity Needs of Individuals with Disabilities; and Connecting Educational Standards to Student Learning Plans and Policy to the Classroom*.

- **Secondary Transition- Transition Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work.** The Transition Works project is an interagency partnership developed to create and deliver innovative and non-traditional career development, job placement and career advancement activities for over 750 transition age students with significant disabilities in the cities of Boston, Springfield and Worcester. Helping students plan for the future is a major factor in maintaining their interest and purpose for staying in school. The Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC), in partnership with MASSDE, the Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN), Urban Pride, the Massachusetts Workforce Development System, the Commonwealth Corporation, and the Institute for Community Inclusion (ICI), is addressing the unmet transition, career development and employment needs of young adults with significant disabilities ages 16-26.

- **Trauma Sensitive Schools Initiative (SSCE).** Through this initiative MASSDE is working to bring “trauma sensitive” practices to schools across the Commonwealth. The research shows that a high percentage of students who drop out of school have experienced or witnessed trauma in their lives. MASSDE supports efforts that include annual trainings and technical assistance around safe and supportive student learning environments for reducing barriers that affect classroom behavior, relationships, and academic performance, thereby creating a climate that encourages students to stay in school. The Spring 2010 Conference was a joint presentation on Trauma Sensitive Schools and Homeless Education.

- **Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) (SSCE).** The purpose of the EPP is to increase the support and services students need in order to stay in school and meet graduation standards, as well as gained the requisite skills needed for postsecondary success. Districts are required to develop an EPP for any student who does not meet the minimum criteria on the English Language Arts and Mathematics tests of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System.

- **Work-Based Learning Plans (WBLP) for Students with Disabilities (SSCE).** Through work-based learning experiences, students have an opportunity to learn about various career areas and try different work styles, find out what type of work they enjoy, find out how they learn best in a workplace setting, and find out what natural supports are available. By providing the opportunity to explore a variety of career areas and discover what type of work they enjoy in the context of their academic environment, the WBLP promotes students with disabilities staying in school.

- **Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII).** The EWII uses statewide data as a starting point for helping school districts identify students who may be at risk of not graduating on time from high school and supporting students who may be at risk of dropping out. Incoming high school
Massachusetts

districts and schools access and use professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for students with and without disabilities. MFA courses have been integrated into the menu of professional development options available to districts. These courses are designed to help teachers reach all students, especially by identifying and supporting students at risk for failure and dropping out of school.

In cooperation with other agency initiatives and stakeholders, MASSDE has developed a series of initiatives targeted toward at-risk youth and the communities in which they reside. Each of the initiatives allows for inter/intra-agency collaboration, program development for students with disabilities, and/or professional development for practitioners working with students with disabilities:

- Collaboration with Stakeholders
- Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summit
- Secondary School Reading Grant
- Special Education Professional Development Institutes

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, and resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY (2009-2010 data)</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (data and target from 2009-2010 as per instructions from OSEP regarding a one year data lag):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students with IEPs</th>
<th>Number of Students enrolled in 2009-2010 (Grades 9-12)</th>
<th>Number of Dropouts in 2009-2010 (Grades 9-12)</th>
<th>2009-2010 Dropout Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with IEPs</td>
<td>44,874</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE uses the same data that is reported under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), reports the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation, and follows the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

In Massachusetts, a dropout (regardless of disability status) is defined as a student in grades 9-12 in a public school who, prior to graduation, leaves school for reasons other than a transfer to another public school, and who does not re-enroll before the following October 1. To calculate this rate, MASSDE uses dropout data obtained through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) October 1 enrollment report, and omits from the final count any student identified as enrolled on October 1 who earned a General Educational Development (GED) credential. MASSDE also identifies “summer dropouts” and adds their total into the count. Additional information on the data collection and calculation is included in the Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan (MA SPP) for FFY2005-2012, available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/maspp.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/maspp.html).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data):

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

During the current reporting period, MASSDE met its measurable and rigorous target of 4.7% for the dropout rate for students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) for school year 2009-2010. This represents the third consecutive year of decline in the dropout rate for this population. Notable is that the decrease in the number of students with IEPs dropping out of school (2,122 this reporting year compared to 2,246 last reporting year) occurred at the same time that the total number of students with IEPs in
public schools throughout the Commonwealth has increased (44,874 this year compared to 44,693 in the last reporting year). This is also the first time that Massachusetts has met its target since the 2005-2006 reporting year. The improvement trend is illustrated in Graph 1 below.

MASSDE credits this improvement, in part, on the statewide and targeted dropout prevention initiatives that are discussed in the improvement activities section below. MASSDE and its partners will continue to focus on improvement activities targeted to maintaining the decline in the dropout rate for students with IEPs. We look forward to reporting continued improvement in the FFY2011 reporting period.

Graph 1:

![Annual Dropout Rate for Students with IEPs Over Time](source)

Source: Massachusetts Student Information Management System (SIMS), Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Improvement Activities

During FFY2010, through its Student Support, Career, and Education Services unit (SSCE), the Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP), and the Center for School and District Accountability, MASSDE has engaged in the following improvement activities that directly support high school completion for students with IEPs. Additional information is available in Appendix A.

- **Massachusetts Bullying Prevention and Intervention Law:** An Act Relative to Bullying in Schools was signed into law in May 2010. The law requires school leaders to create and implement strategies to prevent bullying and to address bullying and retaliation promptly and effectively. Among other measures, districts must create bullying prevention and intervention plans, provide supports for targets and aggressors, and adopt and implement age appropriate social emotional curricula. Additional provisions amend state special education law to require IEP Teams to address skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing for students with disabilities. These actions are intended to, among other things, address school environment issues that may lead to student attrition.

- **Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad).** MASSDE identified 133 high schools with dropout rates higher than the state average of 2.9% as reported in 2008-2009. Through this award, MASSDE will help support 28 of the targeted schools in implementing a select menu of research and evidence-based practices through technical assistance, professional development, and learning exchanges that will allow for sharing of best practices. In addition, MASSDE will assist schools in a careful analysis of their at-risk students to strengthen strategic dropout prevention, intervention, and recovery approaches. Schools receiving funds must choose...
up to three strategies from a menu of research-based strategies to support and retain students through graduation. The strategies include:

- alternative pathways to meet a range of student needs;
- adult advocates for student support;
- positive school climate and socio-emotional systems of support;
- service-learning and work-based learning models specifically targeting students most likely to not graduate;
- credit recovery, credit acceleration, and distance learning through development of courses/modules, pilot implementation of courses/models, and training of staff;
- expansion of the school year/structured learning time and summer transition programs; and
- programs and systems specifically designed to service transient students, including migrant students, English Language Learner (ELL) students, refugees, immigrants, and other newcomers.

The Dropout Prevention and Recovery Work Group (SSCE) was created as a result of the Graduation and Dropout Prevention and Recovery Commission Report – Making the Connection. The Commission was charged with examining current statewide policies and making recommendations on how to retain at-risk students. The focus of the Work Group is to support district team action planning and to facilitate the sharing of promising practices in order to prevent student dropout and consequently improve graduation rates. The MassGrad Initiative greatly expanded the Work Group by adding the 133 high schools in the state that met this criterion. A continuing practice is for three of the districts to host face-to-face meetings at their sites and demonstrate their promising programs, policies, and practices regarding attendance, discipline, homework, and related activities that show progress in retaining students with disabilities.

The Dropout Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Website (SSCE) includes an extensive collection of graduation and dropout prevention related news and trainings, articles/reports, and websites for students, parents, and educators.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) - IDEA. Activities funded through the ARRA-IDEA grant were to be designed to ensure that students with disabilities have access to a free and appropriate education (FAPE) by providing services and programs that met students' unique needs and prepared them for further education, employment, and independent living. Funds were to be used for 1) recovery purposes (to sustain and support existing special education programming), and 2) investment purposes (to improve educator quality and effectiveness; to support schools, districts, and students; for assessment and data; and to promote college and career readiness).

Many of the districts directed their ARRA allocations to new and/or expanded programs designed to improve school climates and create alternative strategies to suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs. They also allocated funds for credit recovery programs for students returning to school. Some examples of programs include:

- hiring consultants to evaluate their programs and practices regarding suspensions and expulsions and provide technical assistance for designing systemic changes to improve their programs and practices;
- collaborating with other districts to develop and implement programs, including credit recovery programs, virtual and other alternative high schools for students with behavior and/or emotional problems who have high rates of suspension and expulsions; and
- hiring support staff such as guidance counselors, school social workers, school adjustment counselors, with particular therapeutic and counseling skills for this population.
Massachusetts

- **The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Title II-D Technology Competitive Grant Program: Online Courses and Modules Grant for At-Risk High School Students.**

  Fourteen schools receive funding to work collaboratively with MASSDE to create, implement, and evaluate online courses/modules for underserved high school students in alternative education, credit recovery, or credit acceleration programs. Grant recipients include a variety of educational settings: alternative programs and schools, vocational-technical high schools, comprehensive high schools and educational collaborative. The online courses/modules are developed to align with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks or the Massachusetts High School Program of Studies (MassCore). It is anticipated that there will be over 100 courses/modules created, all of which will be co-owned with MASSDE. MASSDE will create a library of courses/modules to make available to schools and districts state-wide.

- **Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools** is an interagency initiative of the Commonwealth’s Executive Office of Health and Human Services. Its mission is to strengthen, expand and integrate Massachusetts state services into a comprehensive, community-based system of care to ensure that families and their children with significant behavioral, emotional and mental health needs obtain the services necessary for success in home, schools and community. These wraparound services provide substantial and specific supports to students who are at high risk for dropping out of school, and to students who have already dropped out and need assistance in returning to school. The Task Force’s final report was issued in August 2011.

- In partnership with the **Central Massachusetts Communities of Care (CCMC) Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS) Grant (SEPP)**, MASSDE provided grant funds to support districts in Worcester County with the development and implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and with the development of “wrap-around” mental health services and supports, for which students at risk for dropping out or those returning to school would be eligible. The participating districts receive professional development and onsite assistance in the development and implementation of the principles of PBIS. In the first year of the program, four districts totaling six schools and over 50 school personnel (including teachers, administrators, related service providers, paraprofessional, parents, and students) participated. In the second year, this first cohort of districts moved from the planning stage to implementation, and the second cohort of six districts entered the first stage. In the third year of the grant, the second cohort completed the implementation stage, and a third cohort of four districts and six schools began the initial, planning stage. The districts that completed implementation reported significant improvement in the type and scope of non-academic supports for students, increased success for struggling students, and improved school culture.

- **Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA) (SEPP)** provides online, graduate level coursework to middle and high school educators across the state. Two content areas, *Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction*, focus on ways to support all students, but especially those with disabilities. The courses enable educators to gain a better understanding of how disabilities affect student learning and behavior, and provide educators with improved skills in the areas of curriculum design, instruction, evaluation, and technology. These skills translate into improved student outcomes, which will lead to decreased dropout rates. Additional MFA courses that positively affect student success and promote decreased dropout rates include *Positive Behavioral Supports, Collaborative Teaching, Family Engagement, and Postsecondary Transition*.

- **National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Professional Development Series (SEPP).** The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), with support from the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN), provides the NASDSE Professional Development Series. These telecasts bring nationally recognized experts to the Commonwealth using technology, providing an affordable means of quality personnel development for a variety of stakeholders. In 2009-2010, series topics were: *Seclusion and Restraint the Impact of Federal...*
Secondary Transition - Transition Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work. The Transition Works project is an interagency partnership developed to create and deliver innovative and non-traditional career development, job placement and career advancement activities for over 750 transition age students with significant disabilities in the cities of Boston, Springfield and Worcester. Helping students plan for the future is a major factor in maintaining their interest and purpose for staying in school. The Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC), in partnership with MASSDE, the Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN), Urban Pride, the Massachusetts Workforce Development System, the Commonwealth Corporation, and the Institute for Community Inclusion (ICI), is addressing the unmet transition, career development and employment needs of young adults with significant disabilities ages 16-26.

Trauma Sensitive Schools Initiative (SSCE). Through this initiative MASSDE is working to bring “trauma sensitive” practices to schools across the Commonwealth. The research shows that a high percentage of students who drop out of school have experienced or witnessed trauma in their lives. MASSDE supports efforts that include annual trainings and technical assistance around safe and supportive student learning environments for reducing barriers that affect classroom behavior, relationships, and academic performance, thereby creating a climate that encourages students to stay in school. The Spring 2010 Conference was a joint presentation on Trauma Sensitive Schools and Homeless Education.

Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP) (SSCE). The purpose of the EPP is to increase the support and services students need in order to stay in school and meet graduation standards, as well as gained the requisite skills needed for postsecondary success. Districts are required to develop an EPP for any student who does not meet the minimum criteria on the English Language Arts and Mathematics tests of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System.

Work-Based Learning Plans (WBLP) for Students with Disabilities (SSCE). Through work-based learning experiences, students have an opportunity to learn about various career areas and try different work styles, find out what type of work they enjoy, find out how they learn best in a workplace setting, and find out what natural supports are available. By providing the opportunity to explore a variety of career areas and discover what type of work they enjoy in the context of their academic environment, the WBLP promotes students with disabilities staying in school.

Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII). The EWII uses statewide data as starting points for helping school districts identify students who may be at risk of not graduating on time from high school and supporting students who may be at risk of dropping out. Incoming high school freshmen are assigned one of five risk levels (Very High Risk, High Risk, Borderline, At Risk, Low Risk) based on their middle school academic performance and attendance records. MASSDE identified those factors that appear to contribute to a student's likelihood of not graduating on time. The 2009-2010 Index is based on three indicators:

1. The student's spring 2009 grade 8 MCAS mathematics score;
2. The student's spring 2009 grade 8 MCAS English language arts (ELA) score; and
3. The student's spring 2009 grade 8 attendance rate.

A student's performance with respect to each of these indicators generates “points” which are then added together. A student's risk level will range from Low Risk (3-23 points) to Very High Risk (51-60 points). Risk levels are assigned to every student for whom the Department has attendance data and at least one year of assessment data.

District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs). Six regionally-based DSACs help identified districts and their schools access and use professional development and targeted assistance to
improve instruction and raise achievement for students with and without disabilities. MFA courses have been integrated into the menu of professional development options available to districts. These courses are designed to help teachers reach all students, especially by identifying and supporting students at risk for failure and dropping out of school.

- In cooperation with other agency initiatives and stakeholders, MASSDE has developed a series of initiatives targeted toward at-risk youth and the communities in which they reside. Each of the initiatives allows for inter/intra-agency collaboration, program development for students with disabilities, and/or professional development for practitioners working with students with disabilities:
  - Collaboration with Stakeholders
  - Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summit
  - Secondary School Reading Grant
  - Special Education Professional Development Institutes

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meets the State’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets for the disability subgroup.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

A. AYP Percent = \[
\frac{\text{(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup)}}{\text{(total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)}} \times 100.
\]

B. Participation rate = \[
\frac{\text{(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)}}{\text{(total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year)}}
\]

C. Proficiency rate = \[
\frac{\text{(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)}}{\text{(total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)}}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</th>
<th>% Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup (3A)</th>
<th>Participation Rate for Students with IEPs (3B)</th>
<th>Proficiency Rate (CPI) for Students with IEPs (3C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Data</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Please note that Massachusetts does not have modified academic achievement standards for students with disabilities.
Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Explanation for Progress or Slippage for 3A – AYP

In FFY2010, the percentage of school districts meeting AYP for the disability subgroup was 49% and 31% for English language arts (ELA) and Mathematics, respectively. While the target of 52% in ELA was not met, this year’s rate is an increase of 4.2 percentage points over the FFY2009 rate. The 42% target in Mathematics was not reached, and there was slight slippage from the FFY2009 rate of 33.7%.

To receive a positive AYP determination in FFY2010, schools and districts must meet a state-established student participation requirement, a student attendance or graduation requirement, and either the State’s FFY2010 performance target for that subject or the district, school, or the subgroup’s own FFY2010 improvement target. MASSDE’s calculation is described in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – How Are AYP Determinations Calculated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A + (B or C) + D = Affirmative AYP Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> MCAS Participation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% or greater participation in Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and MCAS-Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt) tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> MCAS Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.1 or greater Composite Performance Index (CPI) in English language arts (ELA); 92.2 or greater CPI in mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> MCAS Improvement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet or exceed 2010 improvement target (Specific to schools, districts and student groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Additional Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Schools Serving Grades 1-11: 92% or higher attendance rate, or 1 percentage point improvement over 2010</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>High Schools: 4-year graduation rate of 75% applied to the 2010 graduation cohort, or 2 percentage point increase in 4-year graduation rate from the 2009 cohort to 2010 cohort, or 5-year graduation rate of 75% applied to the 2009 graduation cohort.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A group can also make AYP for improvement by reducing the percentage of non-proficient students by 10% from 2010 to 2011 ("safe harbor").

The actual data and calculation for the determination of the number of districts with a disability subgroup that met AYP targets for the subgroup in FFY2010 are as follows:
Table 2: Districts Meeting AYP for Disability Subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of districts with disability subgroup</th>
<th>Number of districts with disability subgroup meeting AYP</th>
<th>Percent of districts with disability subgroup meeting AYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In FFY2010, there were 294 districts with a disability subgroup for English Language Arts (ELA) and 294 districts with a disability subgroup for Mathematics in Massachusetts for whom MASSDE made AYP determinations. MASSDE calculated AYP determinations for the disability subgroup if the group consisted of:

1. 40 students or more assessed in each year for which performance data were being analyzed and the number of subgroup members was at least 5% of the number of students whose assessment results were included in the school or district's aggregate AYP calculation; or
2. 200 or more members.

In accordance with the October 2008 federal requirement that all states set a single graduation rate goal and annual targets, MASSDE adopted a single, statewide graduation rate goal of 95% (four-year rate) by the 2018-2019 school year, and annual targets toward that goal beginning with school year 2009-2010. Starting in FFY2009, for positive AYP determinations, Massachusetts public high schools and districts at the grade 9-12 grade span must also meet at least one of the following criteria:

- A four-year graduation rate of 75% applied to the 2010 graduation cohort;
- A two percentage point increase in the four-year graduation rate from the 2009 cohort to 2010 cohort; or
- A five-year graduation rate of 75% applied to the 2009 graduation cohort.

Graph 1 below includes the actual data from FFY2005 to FFY2010 for districts making AYP and compares the data across these fiscal years to the target for FFY2010. Although the aggregate increase from FFY2005 to FFY2010 is 24 and 12 percentage points in ELA and Mathematics, respectively, the changes over time to the calculations as well as the changing AYP targets demonstrate no clear pattern of performance. Additionally, as the goal for 100% proficiency by 2014 as mandated by NCLB\(^2\) nears, the number of districts not making AYP increases due to the sharp incline of the targets. For further information district and school improvement ratings, see page 6 of the School Leader’s Guide to 2011 Accountability Reports at: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2011/schleadersguide.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2011/schleadersguide.pdf).

---

\(^2\) In September, 2011, MASSDE submitted to the U.S. Department of Education a request for flexibility regarding specific requirements of NCLB. If this request is approved, MASSDE will review proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources for FFY2011.
Graph 1: Percent of School District Making AYP from FFY2005-FFY2010 Compared to FFY2010 Target

![Graph showing percentage points for ELA and Math AYP from FFY2005 to FFY2010 compared to FFY2010 target.](image)

Source: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS).

Massachusetts publicly reports Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) data at:

Explanation for Progress or Slippage for 3B – Participation rate for children with IEPs

In FFY2010, of the 93,687 students with IEPs enrolled in all grades assessed for ELA, 72,383 participated in the regular assessment with accommodations and 10,528 participated without accommodation; 150 participated in an alternate assessment against grade level standards and 8,486 participated in alternate assessments against alternate standards. In Mathematics, 10,545 students participated in regular assessment without accommodations and 72,797 participated with accommodations; 203 students participated in alternate assessment against grade level standards and 8,603 against alternate standards. The total participation rate for ELA was 98.4%. The participation rate from FFY2009 to FFY2010 increased by 0.3 percentage points, and was slightly below the target of 99%. Similarly, the participation rate for Mathematics was slightly below the target of 99% in FFY2010. The total participation rate for Mathematics was 98.6%, an increase of 0.4 percentage points over the participation rate reported in FFY2009.

The participation rate for students with IEPs for FFY2010 is determined by dividing the number of students included in the disability subgroup who participated in MCAS and MCAS-Alt tests by the number of students included in the disability subgroup enrolled in the tested grades on the date the tests were administered. The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in the 2010-2011 school year. Only the amount of time a student spent at the school in which he or she was enrolled on October 1, 2010 factored into the attendance rate for a given school. A student’s attendance rate was not counted toward multiple schools, but was counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out-placed in public collaborative or private alternate schools/programs at public expense. For further information on the calculation of participation, see page 10 of the School Leader’s Guide to 2011 Accountability Reports at: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2011/schleadersguide.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2011/schleadersguide.pdf).
Table 3 below includes the actual data used to calculate the FFY2010 participation rate for students with IEPs in the MCAS ELA and Mathematics assessments: Table 4 shows the calculation of participation rates.

Table 3: FFY2010 Participation Count of Students with IEPs on Statewide ELA and Mathematics Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY2010 (2010-2011)</th>
<th>Grades 3-5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a # of Students with IEPs Enrolled in Assessed Grades</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>40,402</td>
<td>41,081</td>
<td>12,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>40,408</td>
<td>41,074</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>93,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b # of Students with IEPs Assessed</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>40,071</td>
<td>40,490</td>
<td>11,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>40,173</td>
<td>40,557</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>92,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c # of Students with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>5,231</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>1,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>5,021</td>
<td>4,327</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>10,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d # of Students with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>30,651</td>
<td>32,586</td>
<td>9,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>30,967</td>
<td>32,332</td>
<td>9,498</td>
<td>72,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e # of Students with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f # of Students with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>3,546</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>3,702</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>8,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS).

*Note: The data presented above are presented by the grade spans used for making AYP determinations (as described in Indicator 3A). The difference in the number of students with IEPs in grades assessed in Mathematics (92,330) and ELA (92,163) may have included cases in which students were repeating a grade who previously took MCAS, students who were removed from the calculation on appeal (e.g., students with medically-documented absences whose non-participation caused a school as a whole not to make AYP), and students transferred in or out of the district during the testing period and therefore not completing testing in FFY2010.

The number of students with IEPs who participated in regular assessment with accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) was 72,838 for ELA, and 72,797 for Mathematics. The number of students
who participated without accommodations was 10,528 for ELA, and 10,545 for Mathematics. Students participating in the alternate assessment against alternate standards are as follows: ELA 8,486 and Math 8,603; and against grade-level standards: ELA 150 and Math 208.

Appendix B (at pages 16-17) of the 2011 MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt): State Summary of Participation and Performance Report, available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/alt/11statesum.doc includes additional information regarding the number of students with IEPs in alternate assessments based on grade-level and alternate achievement standards. In addition, Appendix C of that document (at page 18) includes information about the rates and methods of participation of students with disabilities.

In accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f), MASSDE publicly reports data regarding the participation of children with IEPs in statewide assessments at the district and school level. This information is posted to the MCAS 2011 results page at: www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/results http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/results.html and is available through a web link in the “Related Links” box at: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/participation.aspx?linkid=26&orgcode=00000000&fycode=2011&orgt ypecode=0&.

Table 4: Calculation of MCAS Participation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(c) &amp; (d)</th>
<th>(e) &amp; (f)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>Overall Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>10,528 + 72,383</td>
<td>150 + 8,486</td>
<td>92,163</td>
<td>93,687</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>10,545 + 72,797</td>
<td>203 + 8,603</td>
<td>92,330</td>
<td>93,651</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE continues to report a very high participation rate for students with IEPs; this high rate represents nearly full participation. Graph 2 below illustrates the high level of participation rates of students with disabilities in statewide assessments from FFY2005 to FFY2010. At no time during the SPP period has participation been less than 97.6%.
Massachusetts Part B Annual Performance Report (MA APR) for FFY2010
Submitted February 1, 2012; revised April 17, 2012

Explanation for Progress or Slippage for 3C – Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate academic achievement standards

MASSDE has continued to set targets for students with IEPs that are the same as the targets for all students. In FFY2010, the target CPI for all students was 95.1 in ELA, and 92.2 in Mathematics. Actual FFY2010 data show that the CPI for students with disabilities (68.3 in ELA and 57.7 in Mathematics) fell short of these targets. Nonetheless, there has been progress for the disability subgroup this year in Mathematics, an increase of 0.2 percentage points. The FFY2010 data reflect an increase of 1 percentage point over FFY2009 totals in ELA. Additionally, since FFY 2004, the CPI for this subgroup has increased 8.2 percentage points in Mathematics and 3.3 percentage points in ELA. These increases are reported in the graphs below. MASSDE will continue to work to improve results for students with disabilities in this area in FFY2011.

Graph 3:
To calculate proficiency rate, MASSDE uses the CPI, a 100-point index that assigns 100, 75, 50, 25, or 0 points to each student participating in the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and MCAS Alternate Assessment (MCAS-Alt) tests based on his or her performance. The total points assigned to each student are added together, and the sum is divided by the total number of students assessed. The result is a number between 0 and 100, which constitutes a district, school, or subgroup’s CPI for that subject and student group. CPIs are generated separately for ELA and Mathematics, and at all levels – state, district, school, and student subgroup. For additional details on the CPI, please see the School Leaders’ Guide to the 2011 Accountability Reports, at: http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2011/schleadersguide.pdf.

Table 5 is populated with the actual data used to calculate the FFY2010 proficiency rate for children with IEPs and the proficiency rate calculations.
Table 5: Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs in Statewide Assessments – ELA and Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY2010 (2010-2011)</th>
<th>Grades 3-5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>6,384</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td>5,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6,748</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>3,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>8,742</td>
<td>13,436</td>
<td>5,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9,135</td>
<td>6,205</td>
<td>4,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>39,988</td>
<td>40,421</td>
<td>11,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>40,078</td>
<td>40,479</td>
<td>11,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and Massachusetts Student Information Management System (SIMS).
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**Improvement Activities**

In FFY2010, MASSDE engaged in intra-agency activities and initiatives intended to improve outcomes for all students. The Special Education Policy and Planning (SEPP) unit’s presence in the planning and implementation stages of these activities has ensured that the needs of students with disabilities are addressed. SEPP staff is participating in discussions and program development in cooperation with the following units in MASSDE (see Appendix A for specific activities):

- School and District Accountability and Assistance
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Secondary School Services
- Elementary School Services
- Student Support Services
- Student Assessment

A number of improvement activities are intended to promote student achievement and to improve results for students with disabilities on statewide assessments. Some of the activities are as follows:

- **ARRA Entitlement Grants**, which provide professional development, updated technology, and instructional materials to promote increased numbers of students with disabilities reaching proficiency on statewide assessments, were awarded.

- MASSDE has a long standing relationship with the **Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN)**, the Parent Training and Information Center federally funded to provide free information, support, technical assistance, and workshops to Massachusetts’ families who have children with disabilities. FCSN provides training and technical assistance to families throughout Massachusetts on behalf of MASSDE. In FFY2010, training topics included Parent’s Rights, IEPs, Understanding My Child’s Learning Style, The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), Turning 14 – Embedding Transition Planning Form into Training, 504 Plans, Discipline and Suspension, Creating a Vision, Celebrate Yourself, and Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS).

- **Collaboration between MASSDE Curriculum and Instruction Mathematics Office and Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP)**. With input and guidance from the urban superintendents, the Massachusetts Urban Math Liaisons network (Mathematics directors who provide guidance and support around Mathematics in Massachusetts public schools) identified the need to improve support for students with disabilities as a critical priority in urban districts. In response to this need, meetings will be dedicated to developing a district level collaboration between special educators and Mathematics specialists. This will support the performance of students on statewide Mathematics assessments.

- **Collaboration with Stakeholders** has included providing statewide assessment data to the statewide Special Education Advisory Council, the Special Education Steering Committee, and interest groups to discuss targets, current data, and improvement activities for students with disabilities on statewide assessments.

- MASSDE holds an annual **Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summit**, the purpose of which is to share MASSDE resources for strengthening curriculum, instruction, and assessment; identify needs for future development of curriculum resources and technical assistance; and build capacity of MASSDE, districts, and schools through regional partnerships. In FFY2010, the topics from the Summit
that related to statewide assessment were: Starting Out Right: Preventing and Closing the Achievement Gap; Curriculum Alignment; Online Courses and Resources for Standards-Based Teaching and Learning; Narrowing Achievement Gap in Reading and Writing; Addressing the Achievement Gap: Parents as Teachers and Partners; Effective Math Instruction for English Language Learners; The Integration of Science and Literacy; Tiered Instructional Models; The Role of the Arts in Raising Academic Achievement; Tools for Differentiated Curriculum and Instruction; Implementing a Balanced Assessment System; Supporting Student Achievement in Science and Technology/Engineering; and Math Learning Communities in Practice.

- **District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs).** MASSDE has opened six regionally-based DSACs to help identified districts and their schools to access and use professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for all students. MFA courses (see below), including UDL, Creating Positive Classroom Environments, and Transition Planning have been integrated into the menu of professional development options available to districts through the DSACs. These courses have a positive effect on instruction for and performance of students with disabilities.

- **Educational Proficiency Plans (EPPs).** Beginning with students in the class of 2010, school districts must develop an EPP for any student who does not score at 240 or above on the grade 10 ELA and Mathematics MCAS tests. The EPP must identify the student’s strengths and weaknesses, based on MCAS and other assessment results, coursework, grades, and teacher, student, and counselor input. The purpose of the requirement is to increase the likelihood that students will meet state and local standards to graduate from high school, including achieving success on the MCAS tests, and will have the requisite skills needed for postsecondary success.

- **The Secondary School Reading Grant** is a grant program that selects middle schools, high schools, and vocational schools with poor MCAS performance or with unusually large special education populations to receive four years of funding to develop and implement school-wide approaches to improving reading achievement across content areas, including: involvement of and training for all professional and paraprofessional staff; reading across content areas; targeted intervention programs for struggling readers; adequate time for reading instruction; assessment that drives instruction; flexible grouping patterns; and leadership structures that provide ongoing support and guidance for all students. These efforts have a direct effect on student participation in and performance on the ELA MCAS tests.

- **Special Education Professional Development Institutes** offered professional development opportunities to educators in FFY2010 in a variety of areas to allow educators to improve their capacity to provide differentiated, responsive classroom instruction, which in turn will lead to improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities. Some of the topics related to statewide assessment included Building World Knowledge through Reading and Writing Informational Texts; Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling; The Massachusetts New Literacies Institute; Teaching Advanced Mathematical Decision Making; Reasoning and Problem Solving: Number Sense, Algebra, and Measurement; Middle and High School Mathematics: The Bird’s View and the Frog’s View; Fractions for Elementary School Teachers; Improving Spoken and Written Language: From Research to Practice; Managing Behavior in the Inclusive Classroom; Meeting the Academic and Non-Academic Needs of Students with Asperger Syndrome; Strategies for Students with Sensory Processing Disorders in Inclusive School Settings; Technology for Children with Visual Impairments and Multiple Disabilities; Mathematics and Science Content Vocabulary for Educators of the Deaf; and Promoting Access to Learning.

- **Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA)** provides online, graduate level coursework to middle and high school educators across the state. Courses include: Differentiated Instruction, Universal Design for Learning, Positive Behavior Supports, and Collaborative Teaching. The courses help educators gain a better understanding of how a disability affects student learning, and provide
educators with improved skills in the areas of curriculum design, instruction, and technology. These skills translate into improved student outcomes.

- MASSDE participated in and supported professional development opportunities provided through the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Professional Development Series in which national experts provide information via telecast on a variety of high-interest topics including Connecting Educational Standards to Student Learning Plans and Policy to the Classroom.

- Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII). Using a statistical regression model, MASSDE has developed a predictive tool to identify students at risk for not achieving graduation in four years or less of high school. Based on middle school data (grade 7 and 8), ninth graders from several urban districts are grouped according to five at-risk categories designate by degrees of risk. The findings are distributed to the appropriate districts for them to design targeted, student centered interventions which will help improve performance scores, as measured by CPI for students with disabilities on statewide assessments.

Numerous activities focused on student assessment contributed to the state’s continued success in meeting its targets for Indicator 3. The MASSDE Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP) works to ensure the needs of students with disabilities are addressed by the following activities:

- Closing the Achievement Gap Legislation
- Secondary Transition- Transition Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work
- Sign Language Video Resource Library
- Special Education Leadership Academies and Seminars
- Special Education Website
- Revision of “Ten Step Guide for Comprehensive Education Assessment of Students with Visual Impairments”
- An Act Relative to Bullying in Schools
- Massachusetts Task Force on Behavior Health and Public Schools
- Preschool to Grade 3 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Alignment Project – Fund Code 264A & 264B

In addition to these improvement activities, MASSDE maintained web-based resources for professionals including MCAS-Alt Newsletters, resource guides, and educators’ manuals, and updated the document entitled Requirements for the Participation of Students with Disabilities in MCAS. The purpose of the latter is to provide guidelines for the participation of students with disabilities in statewide tests and to familiarize educators, and parents and guardians, with available test accommodations. MASSDE’s Student Assessment Services unit holds annual sessions for school personnel about conducting the MCAS-Alt tests for students.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Massachusetts' definition of “significant discrepancy” is a suspension/expulsion rate of five times the state rate for two consecutive years.

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

Massachusetts' definition of "significant discrepancy", by race or ethnicity, is a suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities in a particular race that is five times the state suspension rate for students with disabilities for three consecutive years.

Indicator 4A – Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2009-2010 target)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data per instructions for a one year data lag):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009-2010 Special Education Enrollment</th>
<th>2009-2010 State Suspension/Expulsion Rate</th>
<th>% of districts with suspension/expulsion rate of five times State Rate* **</th>
<th>% of districts with a finding of significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions* ***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>164,847</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9% (7 districts)</td>
<td>0.56% (2 districts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thirty-two districts with fewer than 30 students in special education were removed from this part of the calculation. With 392 districts in the state, the total number of districts included in the calculation was 360. Districts with fewer than 30 students in special education were individually considered in the analysis. **The calculation is (7/360) x 100. ***The calculation is (2/360) x 100.

**Indicator 4B - Percent of districts with (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2009-2010 target)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data per instructions for a one year data lag):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Districts*</th>
<th>Number of districts that have (a) a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards</th>
<th>% of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Total Number of Districts*</td>
<td>Number of districts that have (a) a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs</td>
<td>Number of districts that have (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Districts with 20 or fewer students from a single race or ethnicity were removed from this part of the analysis.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data)

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

Indicator 4A

The data presented in the table above related to Indicator 4A are based on the state’s definition of “significant discrepancy” as a district having a suspensions/expulsions rate of five times the state rate for two consecutive years. In this reporting year, two districts (0.56% of all districts) met the threshold of exceeding the state rate by five times for two years in a row, and therefore were determined by MASSDE to have a “significant discrepancy” in their rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year. The rate is consistent with that which was reported in the FFY2009 MA APR (0.57%, representing two school districts). MASSDE showed no change this year in its results for Indicator 4A.

While MASSDE has not met its target of a 0%, or no districts with a significant discrepancy rate of suspensions and expulsions for students with IEPs, longitudinal review of data from the SPP period shows that the number of districts identified with a suspension/expulsion rate that is five times greater than the state rate in a given year has been relatively consistent: six districts in 2004-2005, four districts in 2005-2006, four districts in 2006-2007, five districts in 2007-2008, four districts in 2008-2009, and now seven districts in 2009-2010.

During this same period, the state’s rate of state suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs showed slight increases (less than half of one percent) that remained greater than the rigorous target of 0.0% set in FFY2005. These rates were 0.51% in 2004-2005, 0.92% in 2005-2006, 1.0% in 2006-2007, and 1.2% in 2007-2008. In the last reporting year, 2008-2009 the rates remained the same as the previous one at 1.2%. This year, 2009-2010, the rate for suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs has again increased slightly to 1.3%, as illustrated in Graph 1.
Although discouraged by the slight increase in the state rate of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs, MASSDE suspects that this may be partially the result of the increased focus on bullying – its causes and prevention - across the Commonwealth since the adoption of Chapter 92 of the Acts of 2010, An Act Relative to Bullying in Schools, in May 2010. Bullying behaviors have always been a serious concern for all students, and especially for students whose disabilities make them more vulnerable to being bullied and also to unknowingly engage in bullying behavior as aggressors. Following two tragic suicide deaths of students in Massachusetts who were the targets of bullying, and the enactment of the new law, school districts have re-focused efforts to comply with requirements for identifying, reporting and responding to all behaviors and incidents related to bullying or the potential for bullying. As a result, MASSDE believes an outcome of this attention may be seen, in part, in the increased rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days of all students and, therefore, also of students with IEPs.

Response to Significant Discrepancy

For the two districts found to have significantly discrepant rates of suspensions and expulsions, MASSDE reviewed the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and supports, procedural safeguards, and data collection practices. Following these reviews, both districts were required to take corrective actions to revise policies, practices, and procedures and to submit to MASSDE Corrective Action Plans and subsequent documentation describing their remedies and illustrating appropriate practice. Both districts did so. One district’s Corrective Action Plan required additional information regarding (1) procedural safeguards for manifestation determinations for students with disabilities when their suspensions exceeded ten consecutive school days, and (2) procedural requirements applied to students not yet eligible for special education. Because of these remaining issues, MASSDE required the district to submit
regular progress reports until MASSDE determined by subsequent document review that full implementation of remediation was met within a year of determination of significant discrepancy. The other district’s Corrective Action Plan and subsequent documentation submitted to MASSDE was determined to have included the required corrections and revisions of their policies, practices, and procedures requested by MASSDE.

In addition to instructing the school districts to take specific corrective actions to remediate the identified significant discrepancies in policies, procedures, and practices, MASSDE also conducted other analyses of the school districts’ data, and compared the actual numbers of students suspended for more than 10 days or expelled in the districts with identified significant discrepancy to the rates of expulsion and suspensions for students without IEPs, data that was produced by the district, but not readily available at the state level. After these reviews, MASSDE determined that both the districts with significant discrepancies in their rate of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in the 2009-2010 school year had remedied their noncompliance within one year of notification.

Data Analysis – Unique District Factors

An analysis of the seven districts with suspension/expulsion rates of over 10 days of students with IEPs five times the state rate this year, reveals that four districts, or approximately 57% of all of them, are charter schools. One of these schools began as a credit-recovery high school program for students who had already dropped out of school. As part of its design, the school rigorously adhered to a tiered system of behavior supports and accountability, and zero tolerance of behavior code violations. Now, in addition to these students, the school has expanded its services to students in other high risk categories including students involved with the courts and other social service agencies. The three other charter schools with suspension/expulsion rates of students with IEPs five times the state rate this year are inner city schools located in high crime areas and serve economically, racially, culturally and linguistically diverse groups of learners.

Any district with suspension and expulsion rates that exceed five times the state rate for any two years during the SPP period (FFY2005 to FFY2012), regardless of whether these years are consecutive and meet the criteria of significant discrepancy, are reviewed by and receive assistance from MASSDE. MASSDE offers targeted assistance in response to the identified factors that have led to the discrepancies. Assistance might include consultation and technical assistance on relevant topics such as districts’ self assessments of policies, procedures, and practices; more extensive and individualized analyses of school-based data; resources for creating and sustaining positive learning environments, differentiating instruction, creating a balance between student support services, and discipline; and promoting networking with other districts with similar profiles.

Reporting Variations

MASSDE continues to be concerned about the variation in the data received from the districts and believes much of this to be a result of inconsistent definitions, policies, and procedures at the local level. Such variations might include, but not be limited to, zero-tolerance policies, “point systems” where classroom removal results from an accumulation of negative points from several infractions rather than a single incident, in-school suspensions or “detention.” In response to noted variations, MASSDE has increased its efforts to work with school districts on definitions and reporting systems to ensure that the data are appropriately identified and reported (see description of improvement activities below) including data related to bullying behaviors, and that districts have an improved understanding of alternatives to suspension.

In addition, MASSDE has increased its efforts to design activities that benefit all students - those with or without IEPs - and definitions, policies, procedures and intervention activities, wherever possible, should be consistent for all students. Additional activities to meet the needs of students with IEPs and/or regulatory compliance are designed within this context.

Indicator 4B

In the FFY2009 reporting period (2008-2009 data), MASSDE used a weighted and alternative risk ratio to determine significant discrepancies among its special education students. However, OSEP did not approve this methodology because MASSDE was not able to compare the rate of suspension among students with disabilities to general education students. In the FFY2010 reporting period (2009-2010...
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data), MASSDE changed its calculation method to a single state bar that compares suspension rates only among students with disabilities.

Under the new calculation, MASSDE identifies a district as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs rates if, for three consecutive years, the district’s suspension rate for students with disabilities in a particular race or ethnicity has been five times the state suspension rate for students with disabilities overall. MASSDE uses a minimum cell size of 20 students with IEPs for each racial/ethnicity group.

In the current reporting period (FFY2010 using (2009-2010 data), 370 districts had more than 20 students with IEPs in at least one racial/ethnicity group, and 22 districts did not. Therefore, 22 districts were excluded from the analysis. Using the new methodology, MASSDE identified a corrected baseline using FFY2007 through FFY2009 data. MASSDE identified seven districts that, for three consecutive years, have been five times the state suspension rate for students with disabilities overall. MASSDE will begin the process of reviewing conducted reviews of these districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. At that time, MASSDE will identify which of these seven districts had policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to their significant discrepancy. Similar to 4A, MASSDE will identify those districts whose rates of suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs in any racial or ethnic category exceed the state rate for any single year, as “at-risk” for significant discrepancy, and will design assistance targeted to specific district needs.

Upon completion of its review of the policies, procedures and practices of the seven districts, MASSDE found three of the seven districts had areas in need of correction that had been identified by the Program Quality Assurance unit as part of the district monitoring. Each of the three districts had received a finding of non-compliance in one or more areas related to their policies, procedures and practices and had engaged in corrective action and the corrective action was completed in a timely fashion. For the first district, MASSDE found the statement that “a copy of the procedural rights and protections of a student with disabilities may be obtained from the Dean of Support Services” needed clarification and required the district to revise the school’s code of conduct/student handbook to include the procedures assuring due process in disciplinary proceedings and appropriate procedures for the discipline of students with special needs and students with Section 504 Accommodation Plans. The district was required to provide a copy of the text that would be added and evidence that these procedures were reviewed with key personnel responsible for the implementation. The district did so and MASSDE approved the corrections.

The second district was found to be in need of correction for its lack of policies and procedures in place for the provision of services once the Team determines that a behavior is not a manifestation of the disability and the suspension or expulsion may go forward or for students who have been placed in an interim alternative educational setting. It was also cited for its lack of statements of procedures assuring due process in disciplinary proceedings or for the appropriate procedures for the discipline of students with special needs and students with Section 504 Accommodation Plans. MASSDE required the district to develop and submit procedures regarding suspensions when they exceed ten days or a pattern has developed for suspensions exceeding 10 cumulative days, and to rewrite the student handbook. It also required the district to submit evidence of the changes including copies of the student handbook, professional development and internal monitoring of all of these issues. The district made the corrections in a timely fashion.

The third district (also identified in 4A) was required to submit corrective action plans to revise policies, practices and procedures relating to procedures for suspension up to 10 days and after 10 days; procedures for suspension for students with disabilities when suspensions exceed 10 consecutive school days or a pattern has developed for suspensions exceeding 10 cumulative days; and procedural requirements applied to students not yet determined to be eligible for special education. MASSDE required the district to conduct internal reviews for each category of non-compliance to submit the results to MASSDE for analysis.
The two separate reviews were:

(1) of the student records of all students with IEPs suspended up to and after 10 days and the following information was submitted to MASSDE:

- the numbers of records reviewed,
- the number of records found to be in compliance,
- the root cause for any noncompliance,
- the district’s plan to address any continued noncompliance.

(2) of the student records of all students not yet determined to be eligible for special education that were part of a disciplinary action and the following information was submitted to MASSDE:

- the numbers of records reviewed,
- the number of records found to be in compliance,
- the root cause for any noncompliance,
- the district’s plan to address any continued noncompliance.

The district conducted the reviews, submitted their reports in a timely manner, and thereby, verified its corrections. It is no longer considered out of compliance.

Thus, none of the seven districts were found to be significantly discrepant, by race or ethnicity, in their rates of suspensions/expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs nor had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to this and did not comply with requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The following table shows the number of incidences in each racial/ethnicity groups that were flagged in the FFY2010 reporting period.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number of Incidences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education School Safety and Discipline Report.
OSEP Part B FFY2009 SPP/APR Response Table

OSEP instructed MASSDE to include in its FFY2010 APR a report of the correction of noncompliance that MASSDE identified based on 2008-2009 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR § 300.170(b). This report must include verification that each identified school district identified (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data, and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the school district. OSEP also instructed MASSDE to describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

MASSDE required the two districts identified under Indicator 4A in FFY2009 (using 2008-2009 data) with significant discrepancies to submit written documentation, with examples and/or documentary evidence where appropriate, of the revisions the districts made to their policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior interventions and supports, procedural safeguards, and data collection practices.

MASSDE required one district to augment procedures included in the student handbook for conducting an expedited evaluation to determine eligibility when a student who is not yet determined eligible for special education but is suspected of having a disability is facing disciplinary action 34 CFR § 300.534. The district submitted documentary evidence of corrective actions taken to make this change to reflect appropriate procedural requirements for conducting an expedited evaluation in certain cases when a student not yet determined eligible is facing disciplinary action. MASSDE has determined that the district is complying with this requirement, and that the district has therefore rectified the noncompliance. In this particular instance, non-compliance did not occur with regard to specific students; rather, the non-compliance was procedural non-compliance that could affect specific students, but was not identified as having resulted in the significant discrepancy determination.

The review of policies, procedures and practices for the second district identified with a significant discrepancy in its rate of suspensions and expulsions using 2008-2009 data revealed three areas that required revision: (1) procedures for suspension up to and after 10 days (34 CFR § 300.530); (2) procedures for suspension of students with disabilities when suspensions exceed 10 consecutive days (34 CFR § 300.530); and (3) procedural requirements applied to students not yet determined to be eligible for special education (34 CFR § 300.534).

MASSDE instructed the school district to take several steps to rectify the deficiencies. First, MASSDE required the district to provide a district-wide training to building-based teams regarding the correct regulatory requirements relevant to these three issues. Following the training, MASSDE required the district to analyze its implementation of the correct requirements by reviewing the records of students with IEPs who were suspended or expelled after the training. The district engaged in a self-assessment practice and as part of this process, and was required to document the names of students and number of student records reviewed; the number of records found out of compliance with regard to the previously identified compliance areas; the root cause for any noncompliance based on how policies, practices, and procedures were implemented; and the district’s plan to address any continued noncompliance. While completing this review, the district was required to submit to MASSDE written reports and documentation demonstrating its progress toward implementing the corrections. As a result of these actions, the district reported that 180 records of students suspended up to ten days and after ten days were reviewed and contained documentation that each of the previously deficient areas of policy, practice, and procedure were complied with in each instance; all records documented the district’s full compliance of applicable regulatory requirements regarding suspensions. In addition, the district reviewed 77 records of students whose suspensions exceeded ten consecutive days; the records contained documentary evidence demonstrating compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. Finally, the district reviewed 13 records of students not yet identified to be eligible for special education following the training, and all records were found to be in compliance with the procedures for expedited when appropriate.

Following MASSDE’s review of the district’s written documentation, MASSDE determined that all the corrections had been made in a timely matter and the district had rectified all identified noncompliance by
amending incorrect policies, practices, and procedures, and properly implementing applicable regulatory requirements.

OSEP also instructed MASSDE to report on the actions taken to ensure that the identified school districts have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the districts. As part of its own improvement activities and corrective actions, MASSDE has reviewed and revised its own practices regarding data collection and reporting, and identification and verification of correction of noncompliance. During the MA SPP reporting period prior to OSEP’s request, MASSDE’s focus was on identifying and addressing systemic root causes of significant discrepancy and designing district specific interventions to reduce the rates of suspension and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with IEPs. With this in mind, MASSDE’s identification of significant discrepancy was made by analyzing overall rates of suspension and expulsion in a district, rather than using individual student data as is used in calculating compliance rates in other compliance indicators, those districts identified as significantly discrepant in the rates of suspensions/expulsions were then reviewed by MASSDE for the appropriateness of policies, procedures, and practices regarding suspensions and expulsions. As part of its review of documentation provided by the school districts, MASSDE completed individual, in-depth reviews of a sample of individual student records in order to identify, where possible, any cause of non-compliance. In those instances where an issue(s) was identified, MASSDE required the district to take specific actions to correct that noncompliance that would affect all children with IEPs within the district, whether or not they had been suspended or expelled in the period at issue. Without individual student records from which noncompliance was identified, and multiple years of data that go into the calculation, MASSDE was unable to have districts correct individual instances of noncompliance.

Based on preliminary feedback from OSEP on the applicability of OSEP Memorandum 09-02 and its applicability to Indicator 4A, MASSDE is now reviewing and revising its practices regarding the data collection and monitoring in order to reflect individual, student specific data now required by OSEP. The correction activity required for the second district as described above is an example of MASSDE’s efforts. Additional information about these activities will be reported in the FFY2011 APR.

**Improvement Activities**

In recognition of the importance of non-academic, social, emotional and family related factors for school success, and the emerging body of research that has shown the relationship of suspensions and expulsions to dropout rates, and suspensions and expulsions to achievement gaps for all students, regardless of disabilities, MASSDE has taken a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary, and proactive approach to identifying and addressing the academic and non-academic factors related to suspensions and suspensions. Within this context, MASSDE’s improvement activities for FFY2010 were three-fold: (1) activities related specifically to incidents of suspension and expulsion and ensuring that districts identified as significantly discrepant or at-risk for significant discrepancy were in compliance as required by 34 CFR § 300.170(b); (2) activities related to the causes and prevention of suspensions and expulsions and improving practices for keeping students in school; and (3) activities related to changing the calculation method for determining significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs (4B).

With regard to the first, MASSDE clarified its definitions related to in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions and expulsions, and patterns of removal of students with IEPs to align with terminology for any student removed from the classroom setting, while at the same time, ensuring regulatory compliance for students with IEPs. Secondly, MASSDE focused on increasing collaboration and participation with interdepartmental and interagency initiatives designed to address non-academic factors related to student supports and interventions with direct and measurable impacts on suspension and expulsion practices for students with IEPs. Some of these initiatives included the Behavioral Health Initiative, the Massachusetts High School and Graduation Initiative (MassGrad), the Central Massachusetts Communities of Care (CCMC) Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS), and the Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS). Each of these activities is discussion more fully below, and in Appendix A.
Thirdly, at OSEP’s request, MASSDE changed its methodology in determining significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs to a single state bar that compared suspension rates only among students with disabilities (4B). Information about this change is discussed above, and in the MA SPP.

The following improvement activities, initiated in FFY2010 or before, are targeted toward reducing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs. See Appendix A for more information.

- **Massachusetts Bullying Prevention and Intervention Law**: An Act Relative to Bullying in Schools was signed into law in May 2010. This law requires school leaders to create and implement strategies to prevent bullying and to address bullying and retaliation promptly and effectively. Among other measures, districts must create bullying prevention and intervention plans, provide supports for targets and aggressors, and adopt and implement age appropriate social emotional curricula. MASSDE created several resources for district use, including an advisory to assist the districts with considering the needs and rights of, and regulations that apply to students with IEPs. Two sections of the law have specific implications for the IEP process and for students with disabilities: (1) whenever the Team evaluation indicates that a student’s disability affects social skills development, or when the student’s disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment or teasing, the IEP must address the skills and proficiencies need to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing and (2) for students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum, the IEP Team must consider and specifically address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teaching. The new regulations and districts’ attention to its legal responsibilities in the early identification and responses to bullying, and in subsequent design of prevention activities, have resulted in districts’ reviewing, modifying, and in some cases, changing their policies and procedures relative to the suspension and expulsion of all students, including students with IEPs. MASSDE has distributed resources designed to assist district in their development of alternative programs to suspensions to be incorporated into their Bullying Prevention and Intervention Plans.

- **Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad)** is a federally funded grant awarded during the 2009-2010 school year, the purpose of which is to support statewide and local efforts for high school dropout prevention, intervention and recovery. Research is clear in demonstrating the relationship of suspension/expulsion and dropout. Students who are suspended are not learning skills and knowledge that will advance them toward graduation nor alternative, positive behaviors that will keep them in the learning environments. The grant’s focus in Massachusetts is on the 133 high schools that exceeded the state dropout rate of 2.9% in school year 2008-2009. MassGrad engages these high schools in conducting a careful analysis of who their at-risk students are, and implementing and strengthening strategic dropout prevention, intervention and recovery approaches. MASSDE will collaborate with individual schools, districts, and community partners and support their efforts with technical assistance, training and the exchange of promising practices. MassGrad’s student population includes all students – those with or without disabilities. All four of the Key Activities described in Appendix A are relevant to students with IEPs, though two of them have directly support issues affecting the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs: (1) creation of a State High School Graduation Coalition that promotes a public information campaign and shares promising practices for dropout prevention will also address issues about keeping students in the classrooms in schools; and (2) implementation of research-based practices which will include practices relevant to the reduction of suspension rates for all students and the design and implementation of alternative programs to suspension.

- **Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA)**. The MLA was created to meet the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach students with moderate disabilities by assisting teachers who are currently on waivers to earn licensure. The MLA provides three-credit, graduate-level courses that address the competencies for the preliminary licensure of Teacher of Students with Moderate Disabilities. MLA courses will be delivered through the Massachusetts Online Network for Education (MassONE). An RFR for the first two courses of the MLA was completed, posted, and awarded to Fitchburg State University during this reporting year. The two
courses are: (1) SE1: Federal and State Laws, Education Terminology and the Role of Other Agencies Pertaining to the Education of Students with IEPs and (2) SE2: Assessment for Determination of Education Needs, Curriculum, Services and Programs Including Augmentative and Alternative Communication and Other Assistive Technologies. Research has shown that the single most important factor in student success is having effective teachers in the classroom. Providing the skills, knowledge and pedagogy for teaching students with disabilities and creating positive learning environments through rigorous, graduate level courses that address the special education competencies, is a major step toward increasing the number of properly credentialed and effective teachers. The more students feel successful, the less likely they are to engage in behaviors that may lead to suspensions/expulsions.

- **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) - IDEA.** Activities funded through the ARRA-IDEA grant were to be designed to ensure that students with disabilities have access to a free and appropriate education (FAPE), by providing services and programs that met students’ unique needs and prepared them for further education, employment, and independent living. Funds were to be used for (1) recovery purposes (to sustain and support existing special education programming), and (2) investment purposes (to improve educator quality and effectiveness; support schools, districts, and students; for assessment and data; and to promote college and career readiness).

For the second year of the ARRA, 2009-2010, several districts directed their ARRA allocations to continue and/or expand programs designed to improve school climates and create alternative strategies to suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs that were begun in the first year of ARRA. They also allocated funds for credit recovery programs for students returning to school. Some examples include:

- hiring consultants to evaluate their programs and practices regarding suspensions and expulsions and provide technical assistance for designing systemic changes to improve their programs and practices;
- collaborating with other districts to develop and implement programs, including credit recovery programs, virtual and other alternative high schools for students with behavior and/or emotional problems who have high rates of suspension and expulsions; and
- hiring support staff such as guidance counselors, school social workers, school adjustment counselors, with particular therapeutic and counseling skills for this population.

- **The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Title II-D Technology Competitive Grant Program: Online Courses and Modules Grant for At-Risk High School Students** funded projects that work collaboratively with MASSDE to create, implement, and evaluate online courses/modules for underserved high school students in alternative education, credit recovery, or credit acceleration programs. Students with IEPs who have been suspended or expelled often return to alternative education programs. Grant recipients may adapt an online course/module or partner with an organization to design and develop the online courses/modules that align with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks or the Massachusetts High School Program of Studies (MassCore).

- **Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools** is an interagency initiative of the Commonwealth’s Executive Office of Health and Human Services whose mission is to strengthen, expand and integrate Massachusetts state services into a comprehensive, community-based system of care, to ensure that families and their children with significant behavioral, emotional and mental health needs obtain the services necessary for success in home, schools and community. These wraparound services provide substantial and specific supports to students who are already exhibit or are at high risk of exhibiting behaviors that result in suspension or expulsion. The Task Force’s [*final report*](#) was issued in August 2011.

- **Massachusetts 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) – Enhanced Programs for Students with Disabilities** have been in operation for nine years in the Commonwealth and have included students with IEPs in their programs if the students’ disabilities were such that they could be successfully included into existing site programs and facilities. The Enhanced Programs...
The following improvement activities began in FFY2008 or before, and continued in FFY2010:

**Data Collection and Practices Improvement Self Assessment.** MASSDE has created a self assessment document on data collection and management and program improvement self assessment for districts to use to assist them in developing and implementing practices consistent with federal and state regulations regarding the reporting of student discipline. The results of these efforts will allow districts to more accurately report data regarding the removal of a student with an IEP from his/her classroom(s), and will help districts determine whether such removal(s) constitutes an in-school suspension. It is expected that the districts’ use of the *Data Collection and Practices Improvement Self Assessment* will result in a reduction of their use of suspensions and expulsions by increasing their awareness of current, district-specific suspension programs, alternatives to suspension, and the impacts of suspension data.

In keeping with MASSDE’s comprehensive, multi-disciplinary, and proactive approach to identifying and addressing the academic and non-academic factors related to suspensions and expulsions of all students, an **advisory** with new language that is inclusive of all students, is aligned with structured learning time, and meets the regulatory requirements of IDEA has been developed. It includes guidelines for determining whether a removal of a student with an IEP constitutes an in-school suspension, and assistance in developing data collection practices for in-school suspensions and reporting them to MASSDE through the School Safety and Discipline Report (SSDR) and the Student Information Management System (SIMS).

**In partnership with the Central Massachusetts Communities of Care (CCMC) Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS) Grant (SEPP),** MASSDE provided grant funds to support districts in Worcester County with the development and implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and with developing “wrap-around” mental health services and supports, for which students at risk for dropping out or those returning to school would be eligible. The participating districts receive professional development as well as onsite assistance in the development and implementation of the principles of PBIS.

**The Dropout Prevention and Recovery Work Group** was created as a result of *The Graduation and Dropout Prevention and Recovery Commission Report - Making the Connection*. Its focus is to support district team action planning and to facilitate the sharing of promising practices in order to prevent student dropout and improve graduation rates. Through their work, the work group members determined that there was a strong predictive correlation between rates of suspension and dropout, and that implementing practices that reduce the numbers of suspensions and expulsions will also reduce the number of students who drop out. Beginning in FFY2009 and continuing in FFY2010, the group’s work was expanded to 77 urban districts that had at least one high school that exceeded the state’s dropout rate. This accounts for over half of the state’s students who drop out. One hundred thirty-three high schools in the state met this criterion. With the award of the MassGrad grant, the Work Group was incorporated into the MassGrad initiative as one of its Key Activities.
The Dropout Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Website includes an extensive collection of graduation and dropout prevention related news and trainings, articles/reports, and websites for students, parents, and educators.

Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA) provides online, graduate level coursework to educators and related service providers across the state. Three content areas, Creating Positive Learning Environments, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction, have significant impacts on supporting all students, but especially those with disabilities. The courses enable educators to gain a better understanding of how disabilities affect student learning and behavior, and provide educators with improved skills in the areas of curriculum design, instruction, evaluation, technology, and discipline. Additional MFA courses that positively affect student success and promote decreased suspension and suspension rates include Collaborative Teaching, Family Engagement, and Post-Secondary Transition.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Professional Development Series. NASDSE, with support from the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN), provides the telecasts that bring nationally recognized experts to the Commonwealth. This resource uses technology to provide an affordable means of quality personnel development for a variety of stakeholders, including those involved in establishing and/or monitoring policies, procedures and practices relevant to the suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs.

Secondary Transition- Transition Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work. The Transition Works project is an interagency partnership developed to create and deliver innovative and non-traditional career development, job placement and career advancement activities for transition age students with significant disabilities in the cities of Boston, Springfield, and Worcester. Helping students plan for the future is a major factor in maintaining their interest and purpose for staying in school, and for motivating them to change behaviors that are likely to result in suspension and/or expulsion. The Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC), in partnership with MASSDE, the Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN), Urban Pride, the Massachusetts Workforce Development System, the Commonwealth Corporation, and the Institute for Community Inclusion (ICI) is addressing the unmet transition, career development and employment needs of young adults with significant disabilities aged 16-26.

Special Education Professional Development Summer Institutes offered professional development opportunities to educators in FFY2010 in a variety of areas to allow educators to improve their capacity to provide differentiated, responsive classroom instruction which, in turn, will lead to improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities. Courses including Accessible Learning Through Technology and Making Assistive Technology Happen can assist educators in their efforts to design remedial and tutorial programs for students who have been suspended or expelled that will meet their individual needs and learning pace in order for them to “catch up” for missed lessons.

In collaboration with the Program Quality Assurance/Comprehensive Program Review (PQA) unit, MASSDE analyzes districts’ policies and procedures regarding in-school suspensions through scheduled reviews. Because PQA personnel are in school districts on a routine basis, they are afforded an “insider’s” view of district policies and how they are implemented at the local level. PQA’s experience in reviewing districts’ practices has underscored MASSDE’s understanding that the accuracy of the data reported to MASSDE is affected by misinterpretations of the definitions regarding classroom removals, as well as lack of identified personnel to report the data.

Through the Trauma Sensitive Schools Initiative, MASSDE is working to bring “trauma sensitive” practices to schools across the Commonwealth. These efforts include annual trainings and technical assistance around safe and supportive student learning environments for reducing barriers that affect classroom behavior, relationships, and academic performance thereby creating a climate that encourages students to stay in school. The research shows that a high
 percentage of students who drop out or are expelled from school have experienced or witnessed trauma in their lives.

- **Educational Proficiency Plans (EPP).** The purpose of the EPP is to increase the supports and services students need in order to stay in school and meet graduation standards, as well as to gain the requisite skills needed for post-secondary success. Districts are required to develop an EPP for any student who does not meet the minimum criteria on the English Language Arts and Mathematics Tests of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System including those students who have been suspended or expelled.

- **Work-Based Learning Plans (WBLP) for Students with Disabilities.** Work-based learning experiences offer students an opportunity to learn about various career areas and try different work styles, find out what type of work they enjoy, find out how they learn best in a workplace setting, and find out what natural supports are available. By providing the opportunity to explore a variety of career areas and discover what types of work they enjoy in the context of their academic environment, the WBLP encourages students with disabilities to improve their behaviors and stay in school.

- **District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs).** MASSDE opened six regionally-based DSACs to help identified districts and schools access and use professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for students with and without disabilities. MFA courses (see above), including Universal Design for Learning, Creating Positive Classroom Environments, Differentiated Instruction, the Collaborative Co-Teaching Model, and Transition Planning have been integrated into the menu of professional development options available to districts through the DSACs. Because the content of several of these courses addresses strategies and systems for creating safe and appropriate learning environments for all students, and meeting the specific needs of students with IEPs, many of the issues known to impact suspension and expulsions will also be addressed.

- **Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII).** The EWII is the continuation of work begun by MASSDE in cooperation with districts and other partners in May 2008. It is a predictive tool developed to identify students in grade nine who are at risk for not graduating in four years or less. Based on data from seventh and eighth grades, MASSDE sorts students into five levels of at-risk categories and distributes their names to the appropriate districts for them to design targeted, student-centered interventions. This tool was originally designed for use in select urban districts but will be available to all districts during FFY2010. By identifying students at risk for not graduating on time, the districts will also be identifying students with behaviors that result in suspensions and expulsions and will be able to design individualized supports and services as early as possible, as well as implement systemic, school-wide changes including creating positive learning environments.

- **Closing the Achievement Gaps Legislation and the Federal School Turnaround Grants** are related initiatives that provide targeted assistance to underperforming schools/districts. Based on the specific proposals from each district, MASSDE awards funds for consultation, technical assistance and in-kind services designed to close the achievement gaps, meet the needs of all students and improve student outcomes. Many of these proposals include prevention and intervention activities affecting policies, procedures and practices for students with behaviors that might lead to suspension/expulsion. They also include professional development for teachers and other educators to create positive learning environments for all students and support services for students with troubling behaviors.

- In cooperation with other agency initiatives and stakeholders, MASSDE has developed a series of initiatives targeted toward at-risk youth and the communities in which they reside. Each of the initiatives allows for inter/intra-agency collaboration, program development for students with disabilities, and/or professional development for practitioners working with students with disabilities:
Collaboration with Stakeholders
- Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summit
- Secondary School Reading Grant
- Special Education Professional Development Institutes

MASSDE has continued to report suspension/expulsion data publicly. Data tables, available at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx, are being updated to reflect the most recent data available for each district.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2009-2010 data):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives. The MA SPP also includes a description of the revised the method of calculation for 4B as required by OSEP, which necessitated a revision in MASSDE's definition of "significant discrepancy" for 4B.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:
   A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
   B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
   C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 5A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of children with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IEPs aged 6 through 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>served inside the regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>class 80% or more of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day (full inclusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010-2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>86,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149,829 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Data</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010-2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

5A – Full Inclusion

The total number of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in Massachusetts in the FFY2010 reporting period was 145,283. Of those students, 57.9% (or 86,820) were served in the general education classroom 80% or more of the day (full inclusion). While this is short of the measurable and rigorous target by one tenth of a percentage point, it is an increase of 1.1 percentage points over FFY2009 (56.8%) and demonstrates that MASSDE continues to make progress in this area. Improvement can be attributed to districts implementing practices that promote full inclusion of all students. Improvement may also be attributed to activities that focus on improving the quality of instruction for students in general education settings, such as courses offerings through the Massachusetts FOCUS Academy; many are targeted to improve differentiation of instruction and other strategies for effectively teaching in an inclusive classroom.

5B – Substantially Separate Placements

In FFY2010, 15.1% of students (or 22,632) with IEPs, aged 6 through 21, were served inside the general education class less than 40% of the day (substantially separate placements). This is greater than the rigorous target of 14.5%.

Data analysis over time has shown that most students who are moving to full inclusion are coming from the partial inclusion subgroup, rather than from substantially separate placements. The percentage of students in partial inclusion in FFY2010 (20.1%) showed a one percentage point decrease from FFY2009 (21.1%). In contrast, the percentage of students in substantially separate placements has remained consistent over time, as represented in Graph 1 below. This trend has not conformed to MASSDE’s expectations with regard to a least restrictive environment (LRE) initiative.

5C – Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements

The percentage of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements in FFY2010 was 6.7% (or 10,015); there was no change over the percentage reported in FFY2009. While MASSDE did not meet the measurable and rigorous target of 5.5%, this represents stability of the data over time; MASSDE has reported a consistent rate of placement in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements from FFY2005 (6.7%) to FFY2010 (6.7%). This consistency is due, in large part, to the availability of high quality private schools for students with special needs in Massachusetts. The Commonwealth has a strong system of private schools, and a professional organization known as the Massachusetts Association of Approved Private Schools (MAAPS), that are dedicated to serving students with special needs.

In calculating the rate of placement in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements, MASSDE includes public and private separate schools, private residential schools and public residential institutional facilities, and homebound/hospitals. MASSDE does not include in the calculation the number of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities. This is consistent with the calculation method that MASSDE used in previous reporting years. Also, the number of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities was not included in the denominator for the calculations of 5A, 5B, and 5C. Any difference that may exist between the data reported in the State’s 618 data reported in Table 3 for Indicator 5C and the data reported here is the result of this calculation method.

Data Analysis

In order to better understand Massachusetts’ placement data, MASSDE has produced the following graphs demonstrating trends in educational settings over time, for the reporting periods FFY2005 to FFY2010. The graph below illustrates the trends in educational environments from FFY2004 to date, and demonstrates an increase over time in full inclusion environments, with a commensurate decrease in partial inclusion and relative stability of placement in separate environments.
Further analysis of the data by disability category from FFY2005 through FFY2010 indicates that rates of full inclusion have increased for all but one disability category (intellectual impairment) over this time period, while the rates of partial inclusion have decreased in all disability categories. Graph 2 below shows the actual percentage point changes for full inclusion in all disabilities categories for the period FFY2005 to FFY2010.

The highest changes in percentage of full inclusion from FFY2005 to FFY2010 were in the categories of specific learning disabilities (11.4 percentage point increase), emotional disabilities (9.7 percentage point increase), physical disabilities (9.3 percentage point increase), and health disabilities (8.8 percentage point increase).
In this same period, there was a decrease in substantially separate placements for all but one disability category (intellectual impairment). Graph 3 illustrates the change in percentage points in substantially separate placements for all disability categories from FFY2005 through FFY2010.

Graph 3:

The disability categories with the largest percentage point decreases in substantially separate placements during the State Performance Plan (SPP) period to date were sensory/deafblind (4.3 percentage point decrease), emotional (4 percentage point decrease), autism (3.4 percentage point decrease), and multiple disabilities (3.4 percentage point decrease). The disability category of intellectual impairment is the only category in which the rate of substantially separate placements rose during the SPP period to date, with a 4.3 percentage point increase. Given the overall stability of placements in substantially separate classrooms, this is an unusual pattern. MASSDE is concerned both with the increase in the rate of placement of students with intellectual disabilities in substantially separate environments and the pattern demonstrated by the chart above, and will be further analyzing this unusual pattern to determine appropriate interventions, if any.

Improvement Activities

In FFY2010, many of MASSDE’s activities focused on issues pertaining to educational environment. The effect of these activities is demonstrated by the continued and sustained increase in the rate of full inclusion of students with disabilities. Coordination of efforts and initiatives by the MASSDE Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP) to meet the needs of students with disabilities and their educators has had a positive effect on MASSDE’s progress in meeting targets in Indicator 5 and other indicator areas.

Among other initiatives, SEPP staff is participating in discussions and intra-agency program development in cooperation with the following offices in MASSDE (see Appendix A for description of specific activities):

- School and District Accountability and Assistance
- Literacy
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Learning Support Services
- Student Support, Career, and Education Services
- Student Assessment
- English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement
The following FFY2010 improvement activities directly affect LRE and other indicator areas. More information about many of these activities is included in Appendix A of this report.

- MASSDE again encouraged schools to celebrate Inclusive Schools Week™, a national initiative that highlights and celebrates the progress schools have made in providing a supportive and quality education to all students, particularly those who have disabilities and those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. This initiative provides an important opportunity for educators, students, and parents to discuss ways to ensure that their schools continue to improve their ability to educate successfully all students and youth. To promote awareness of this initiative, MASSDE encourages districts to highlight the accomplishments of students, families, school personnel, and community members in promoting inclusive education for all students.

- Through the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Training Project, MASSDE offers online training modules and face-to-face training to Massachusetts educators in a variety of topics. Three training modules have content designed to provide resources to help educators and IEP Teams make appropriate placement decisions and to facilitate student inclusion: The Massachusetts IEP Process, A Principal’s Role and Special Education in Massachusetts, Is Special Education the Right Service?, and The Massachusetts Transition Planning Chart and Effective Transition Planning.

- The Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA) provides online, graduate level coursework to middle and high school educators across the state. Of the content areas offered in FFY2010, Universal Design for Learning – Levels I and II; Universal Design for Learning – Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners in Mathematics; Creating Positive Learning Environments; Differentiated Instruction, and Implementing Collaborative Teaching will have the greatest benefit for LRE initiatives. The courses help educators gain a better understanding of how disability affects student learning and provides them with improved skills in the areas of curriculum design, instruction, and assistive technology. This knowledge and skill-base better enable educators to address individual student needs in the LRE.

- In partnership with the Central Massachusetts Communities of Care (CMCC) Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS) Grant, MASSDE provided grant funds to support districts in Worcester County with developing and implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and with developing “wrap-around” mental health services and supports. One of the priorities of the school district-CMCC partnership is to provide professional development and onsite assistance for PBIS. By increasing the use of PBIS, students with behavioral and/or mental health concerns are more likely to receive the supports needed to participate in less restrictive environments.

- Special Education Professional Development Summer Institutes were sponsored by the MASSDE in partnership with school districts, educational collaboratives, institutions of higher education, and professional associations. The Institutes that directly affect Indicator 5 are those designed to support districts’ efforts to ensure students are educated in the most appropriate, least restrictive environment for their educational needs. Courses included in the FFY2010 Summer Institutes were: Accessible Learning Through Technology; Assessing English Language Learners (ELL) With Disabilities; Collaborative Evaluation Led By Local Educators; Current Issues in School-Based Occupational Therapy & Physical Therapy; Improving Spoken and Written Language: From Research to Practice; Literacy for Students who are Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing; Making Assistive Technology Happen: Assistive Technology for Teaching and Learning; Managing Behavior in an Inclusive Classroom; Meeting the Academic and Non-Academic Needs of Students with Asperger Syndrome; Strategies for Students with Sensory Processing Disorders in Inclusive School Settings; and Technology for Children with Visual Impairments and Multiple
As part of the Special Education Summer Institute, MASSDE annually provides **Special Education Leadership Academies and Seminars**. The academies provide opportunities for school district special education administrators to develop new leadership skills and improve current skills. The programs offered professional development in several areas, including *Instructional Program Design and Improvement and Access to the General Curriculum based on the Massachusetts Curriculum Framework*, both of which will support work around LRE.

In order to facilitate access of students with disabilities to the general education curriculum in the LRE, MASSDE funded the **Secondary School Reading Grant**. Approaches in the grant program include involvement and training for all professional and paraprofessional staff, reading across content areas, multiple targeted intervention programs for struggling readers, adequate time for reading instruction, assessment that drives instruction, a variety of flexible grouping patterns, and leadership structures that provide ongoing support and guidance. Topics discussed included: *Creating a School-wide Approach to Improving Reading; Assessing Literacy Needs; Vocabulary Development; Improving Comprehension; Motivation; Helping the Struggling Adolescent Reader; Content Area Literacy*; and *Effective Writing Instruction*.

**Collaboration between MASSDE Curriculum and Instruction Mathematics Office and Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP)** continued in FFY2010. The Massachusetts Urban Math Liaisons network, Mathematics directors who provide guidance and support around Mathematics in Massachusetts public schools, identified the need to better support students with disabilities in Mathematics as a critical priority in urban districts. In response to this need, the first year of Math Specialist Support meetings were dedicated to developing a district level collaboration between special educators and Mathematics specialists. This second year of this collaborative group was devoted to understanding the characteristics of struggling math learners with disabilities; using the IEP as an instructional tool; making mathematics instruction accessible in the classroom; and establishing protocols for collaborative planning and collaborative teaching (general and special educators).

MASSDE has a longstanding **Collaboration with Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN)**, which is the Parent Training and Information Center that is federally funded to provide free information, support, technical assistance, and workshops to Massachusetts families who have children with disabilities. This year, topics that relate to LRE included: *Parent’s Rights; IEPs; Understanding My Child’s Learning Style*; and *Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)*.

The **Community/Residential Education Project** was developed through an interagency agreement between MASSDE and the Massachusetts Department of Developmental Services (MDDS). This project supports less restrictive, more cost effective residential options, special education services, and community based supports.

The **District and School Accountability and Assistance Office** within the MASSDE’s Center for School and District Accountability reviews districts, with emphasis on how district systems and practices affect each of four groups of students: students with disabilities, English language learners, low-income students, and students who are members of racial minorities.

**District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs)**. MASSDE has opened six regionally-based DSACs to help identified districts and their schools access and use professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for all students. MFA courses (see above) have been integrated into the menu of professional development options available to districts.

**Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Programs for Students with Disabilities (ICE)** provides funding to build and expand partnerships between high schools in public school
districts and state public institutions of higher education to offer inclusive concurrent enrollment opportunities for students with severe disabilities between the ages of 18 and 22, in credit and non-credit courses that include non-disabled students. These partnerships will result in improved systems that better serve students with severe disabilities and support their college and career success. ICE supports the education of students in the LRE as students with severe disabilities are given the opportunity to enroll in postsecondary credit and non-credit classes with their non-disabled peers.

- The revised version of the **Ten Step Guide for Comprehensive Educational Assessment of Students with Visual Impairments** is about to be released. The updated guide reflects current regulatory information and includes information on best practices. It also includes a new section describing the “hidden” characteristics of a vision loss that affect academic and social factors. This resource will enable non-vision specialists to facilitate meaningful inclusion and participation of students with visual impairments throughout the school day.

- Significant progress has been made on the **Sign Language Video Resource Library**. The purpose of this project is to develop STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) vocabulary reference tools that educational interpreters and teachers of students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing may incorporate into their instruction. In addition, as part of this project, MASSDE provides a cost-free institute for educational interpreters to improve participants’ sign vocabulary in the STEM framework.

- **Preschool to Grade 3 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Alignment Project (Fund Code 264)** provided funding to increase districts’ capacities to improve the quality of education and inclusion of children with disabilities through the alignment and coordination of curriculum, instruction, and assessment from preschool to grade 3. Planning grantees researched, discussed, and documented their strategies, training, and progress within and/or across the age span with a focus on how students with disabilities access the general curriculum. Participating districts explored the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in inclusive classrooms; identified best practices to support all students along the preschool to grade 3 continuum; and prioritized areas of strength and needed improvement.

- **Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Grants** support the planning and designing and the development of demonstration sites of the newly developed Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS), a framework for school improvement that focuses on system level change across the classroom, school, and district to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are academically advanced. It guides both the provision of high-quality core educational experiences in safe and supportive learning environments for all students, and academic and/or non-academic targeted interventions/supports for students who experience difficulties and students who have already demonstrated mastery of the concept and skills being taught.

The following activities also promote inclusive practices and contributed to the state’s continued success for Indicator 5:

- **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Entitlement Grants**
- Collaboration with Stakeholders
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Satellite Series
- **Special Education Website**
- **Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools**
- Federal School Turnaround Grants
- Closing the Achievement Gap Legislation
- **Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA)**
- Preschool to Grade 3 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Alignment Project
MASSDE has continued to report school age LRE data publicly. This information, which is currently being updated, is available at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx)

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 6:** Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

Note: States are not required to report on Indicator 6 in the Part B Annual Performance Report for FFY2010.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Measurement: Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = \[
\frac{(# \ of \ preschool \ children \ who \ did \ not \ improve \ functioning) \ \text{divided \ by} \ (# \ of \ preschool \ children \ with \ IEPs \ assessed)}{\times 100}.
\]

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = \[
\frac{(# \ of \ preschool \ children \ who \ improved \ functioning \ but \ not \ sufficient \ to \ move \ nearer \ to \ functioning \ comparable \ to \ same-aged \ peers) \ \text{divided \ by} \ (# \ of \ preschool \ children \ with \ IEPs \ assessed)}{\times 100}.
\]

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = \[
\frac{(# \ of \ preschool \ children \ who \ improved \ functioning \ to \ a \ level \ nearer \ to \ same-aged \ peers \ but \ did \ not \ reach \ it) \ \text{divided \ by} \ (# \ of \ preschool \ children \ with \ IEPs \ assessed)}{\times 100}.
\]

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = \[
\frac{(# \ of \ preschool \ children \ who \ improved \ functioning \ to \ reach \ a \ level \ comparable \ to \ same-aged \ peers) \ \text{divided \ by} \ (# \ of \ preschool \ children \ with \ IEPs \ assessed)}{\times 100}.
\]

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = \[
\frac{(# \ of \ preschool \ children \ who \ maintained \ functioning \ at \ a \ level \ comparable \ to \ same-aged \ peers) \ \text{divided \ by} \ (# \ of \ preschool \ children \ with \ IEPs \ assessed)}{\times 100}.
\]

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioni
Measurable and Rigorous Targets and Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statements</th>
<th>Actual FFY2009 (% and # children)</th>
<th>Actual FFY2010 (% and # children)</th>
<th>Target FFY2010 (% of children)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: ( \frac{c+d}{a+b+c+d} )</td>
<td>81.6% ( (n = 1671) )</td>
<td>75.7% 76.9% ( (n = 2820 \ 2852) ^3 )</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program. Formula: ( \frac{d+e}{a+b+c+d+e} )</td>
<td>52.2% ( (n = 1672) )</td>
<td>52.9% 53.3% ( (n = 2820 \ 2852) )</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)** | | | |
| 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: \( \frac{c+d}{a+b+c+d} \) | 82.4% \( (n = 1672) \) | 75.5% 76.6% \( (n = 2824 \ 2853) \) | 83% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program. Formula: \( \frac{d+e}{a+b+c+d+e} \) | 55.3% \( (n = 1672) \) | 56.3% 56.8% \( (n = 2824 \ 2853) \) | 75% |

| **Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs** | | | |
| 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program. Formula: \( \frac{c+d}{a+b+c+d} \) | 82.8% \( (n = 1667) \) | 77.7% 78.9% \( (n = 2821 \ 2853) \) | 84.5% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program. Formula: \( \frac{d+e}{a+b+c+d+e} \) | 64.8% \( (n = 1667) \) | 56.3% 65.2% \( (n = 2824 \ 2853) \) | 75% |

---

3 Due to a district reporting error, data for one student was reported in only two of the three outcome areas, resulting in the “n” in Outcome A to differ from the “n” in Outcomes B and C. This error could not be identified with more specificity to allow for correction.
### Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY2010 (2010-2011):

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>% of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>497,477</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach</td>
<td>796,820</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>864,882</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>628,638</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>% of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>484,467</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach</td>
<td>720,738</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>865,881</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>723,739</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>2,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>% of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Percent of children who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>394,371</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach</td>
<td>579,595</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>880,892</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>944,968</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,821</td>
<td>2,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Please note that any percentage total exceeding 100% is the result of rounding the subcategory percentages to the nearest tenth.
Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

Summary Statement 1:
The FFY2010 result for Summary Statement 1, **Outcome A was 75.7% 76.9%**: it fell by 5.9 4.7 percentage points from the FFY2009 result, and was 6.3% 5.1% points below the FFY2010 target of 81.6%. The FFY2010 result for Summary Statement 1, **Outcome B was 75.5% 76.6%**: it fell by 6.9 5.8 percentage points from the FFY2009 result, and was 7.5 6.4 percentage points below the FFY2010 target of 83%. The FFY2010 result for Summary Statement 1, **Outcome C was 77.7% 78.9%**: it fell by 5.1 increased by 1.2 percentage points from the FFY2009 result, and was 6.8 5.6 percentage points below the FFY2010 target of 84.5%. Overall, for FFY2010, Summary Statement 1, Massachusetts shows slippage from FFY2009; however, MASSDE showed improvement in Outcome C for this period.

Summary Statement 2:
The FFY2010 result for Summary Statement 2, **Outcome A was 52.9% 53.3%**: it rose by 0.7 1.1 percentage points from FFY2009, and was 22.4 21.7 percentage points below the target FFY 2010 target of 75%. The FFY2010 result for Summary Statement 2, **Outcome B was 56.3% 56.8%**: it rose by 1 1.5 percentage points from FFY2009, and was 10.3 9.8 percentage points below the FFY 2010 target. The FFY2010 result for Summary Statement 2, **Outcome C was 64.7% 65.2%**: it fell increased by 0.4 0.4 percentage points from FFY2009, and was 10.3 9.8 percentage points below the FFY 2010 target of 75%. For FFY2010 Summary Statement 2, Massachusetts made little to no progress from FFY2009.

Massachusetts did not meet its targets for Summary Statements 1, 2, or 3 Outcomes A, B, or C. While MASSDE sets the targets deliberately high because of the importance it places on ensuring better results for this age group, MASSDE is disappointed in the performance results this year. While there may be some differences between cohort that account for some annual change in actual target data, MASSDE continues to work toward achieving progress each year.

In interpreting the results of the progress categories and the summary statements, MASSDE defines “comparable to same aged peers” as meeting a 6 or a 7 on the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). MASSDE provided resources to districts related to child development and what is age appropriate for a 3, 4, or 5 year within these three developmental domains in an effort to ensure that ratings given on the COSF were valid.

In the FFY2009 reporting year, MASSDE exceeded targets set for FFY2010. As a result, the state revised the FFY2010 targets, and set rigorous targets for the extended reporting period, FFY2011 and FFY2012. In analyzing this year’s decline in performance, MASSDE met with the Indicator 7 Interest Group and the Special Education Steering Committee; these stakeholders expressed some concern about the FFY2010 results, but attribute the failure to meet the FFY2010 rigorous targets to the increase in the level of needs for the current population of students included in this FFY2010 report. If the reported data continue to fall below the targets, MASSDE will reconvene with stakeholders to help identify or revise improvement activities.

The FFY2010 data set had a total of 2,820 2,852 students in Outcome 1A; 2,824 2,853 students in Outcome 2B; and 2,824 2,853 students in Outcome 3C. Initially, school districts reported data on 3,038 children. Of those reported, students whose data was incomplete (49 or 1.6% were missing exit dates) or whose time in services was less than six months (36 37 or 1.2%) were excluded from the final data set. None of the students had missing progress question responses and/or impossible progress combinations.

In all three Outcomes for the FFY2010 data set, Massachusetts continues to make gains in Progress Category (a), moving the number of children who did not improve functioning in down to 1% from 1.4% in FFY2009. It is likely the case that more students who may have been in Progress Category (a) are now in Progress Category (b) in Outcomes 1A (from 13.8% in FFY2009 to 17.6% 16.7% in FFY2010), 2 Outcome B (from 12.9% in FFY2009 to 47.2% 16.4% in FFY2010), and 3 Outcome C (from 11.3% in FFY2009 to 43.9% 13% in FFY2010). Massachusetts is also making gains in Progress Category (e) for Outcomes 1A (from 17.4% in FFY2009 to 22.3% 22.4% in FFY2010), 2B (from 17.4% in FFY2009 to 25.6% 25.9% in FFY2010), and 3C (from 28.27% in FFY2009 to 33.5% 33.9% in FFY2010).
Massachusetts is showing a progress decline in Outcome 1 A, Progress Category (c) (from 32.6% in FFY2009 to 28.2% 28.8% in FFY2010) and (e) (from 34.8% in FFY2009 to 30.6 30.9% in FFY2010); Outcome 2 B, Progress Category (c) (from 30.7% in FFY2009 to 25.5% 25.9% in FFY2010) and (d) (from 35.0% in FFY2009 to 30.7% 30.9% in FFY2010); and Outcome 3 C, Progress Category (c) (from 22.8% in FFY2009 to 20.5% 20.9% in FFY2010) and (d) (from 36.7% in FFY2009 to 30.7% 30.9% in FFY2010). Although Massachusetts is making gains in Progress Category (e) for Outcomes 1, 2, and 3 A, B, and C, it is not enough progress to offset the declines in Progress Categories (c) and (d).

In December, 2011, the Indicator 7 Interest Group convened and discussed the results for the FFY2010 APR for Indicator 7 and improvement activities. The group reviewed the FFY2010 data, compared it to the FFY2009 data, and hypothesized that the slippage in Summary Statement 1, especially Progress Categories (c) and (d) for each Outcome, may be the result of significant changes in the types of disabilities and levels of need of children for which data was reported in FFY2009 and FFY2010, and the leveling of resources and supports. Stakeholders shared anecdotal and observational experience with these changes. Additionally, the stakeholder group questioned whether changes in the Early Intervention (EI) regulations in school year 2009-2010 have resulted in an increased level of need seen in the early childhood programs.

MASSDE conducted additional data analysis using FFY2009 and FFY2010 cohort data to review the stakeholder group’s hypothesis. MASSDE reviewed level of need, as determined on each student’s IEP and recorded in the Massachusetts Student Information System (SIMS). Based on this analysis, in FFY2009, 30.1% of students whose data was collected were classified in the ‘Low’ level of need category, compared to 30.5% in FFY2010. The number of students classified in the ‘Moderate’ level of need category declined slightly from 45.5% in FFY2009 to 44.4% in FFY2010; and the ‘High’ level of need category increased slightly from 24.4% in FFY2009 to 25.2% in FFY2010. While changes in identified level of need were not significant for this period, MASSDE will continue to closely monitor this issue in FFY2011, and will work with stakeholders and school districts to address issues regarding changing levels of needs.

**Improvement Activities**

MASSDE, in collaboration with the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (MEEC), completed several improvement activities during FFY2010 to support the work of Indicator 7.

- **Professional development on the Child Outcomes Summary Form and Indicator 7 data collection activities.** All districts in Cycle II FFY2010 cohort were trained on Indicator 7. Training includes a review of the data collection activities as well as how to use the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Resources related to child development, including the Early Child Outcomes Center website, were shared with the districts for use in implementing their local systems of data collection for Indicator 7. Professional development opportunities were provided by webinar and by telephone, both for groups and individual districts. Group webinars were offered at least three times before fall entry and three times, again, before spring exit.

  Additionally, MASSDE focused its professional development on the district’s use of the **COSF Calculator Model 1.0 for 150 Cases (1/14/10)**. The Excel file created by the Early Childhood Outcome Center can be used to generate OSEP progress category information on child outcomes for up to 150 cases. Each district received training on how to input student data onto the spreadsheet, and instructions on how to transmit that data to MASSDE.

  - **Ongoing technical assistance and support.** Districts are provided with ongoing technical assistance and support in the collection of entry data and the collection of progress/exit data, and uses of those data. This technical assistance and support included use of the MASSDE “Security Portal,” a secure web-based file exchange system which is used for the transmission of COSF Calculator excel forms from each district to MASSDE.

  - **Data Quality Improvement.** For the FFY2010 APR, MASSDE analyzed the student data for all of the districts that participated in the Indicator 7 data collection using the **COSF Calculator Model 2.0 - Analytic Versions with Expanded Descriptive Output and Summary Statements (4/16/10)**. This excel form uses COSF ratings data to generate OSEP progress category
information on child outcomes (i.e., the data that must be submitted to OSEP every February), summary statement percentages, charts showing entry and exit COSF ratings, descriptive information on "a" and "e" progress categories across all three outcomes, and some basic descriptive information about the data. In addition, this Excel form creates a summary of common data issues which filters the following data from the final calculations: children with missing entry dates; missing exit dates, time in service less than six months; children with usable data on at least one outcome; usable data on all three outcomes. In the past, MASSDE filtered the data manually, as each district’s data was inputted into a master spreadsheet; progress categories across all three outcomes were computed using a statistical analysis package. By utilizing the COSF Calculator Model 2.0, MASSDE is using a system which allows for less human error.

The COSF Calculator Model 2.0, used in tandem with careful data screening and cleaning by MASSDE, provides an added layer of quality assurance to MASSDE’s Indicator 7 data analysis endeavors.

- **Preschool to Grade 3 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Alignment Project (Fund Code 264A & 264B).** The purpose of this three–year grant program from MASSDE is to identify and support strategies and resources that increase the capacity of districts to improve the quality of education and inclusion of children with disabilities by aligning and coordinating curriculum, instruction, and assessment from preschool to grade 3. As grantees, school district teams will be able to research, discuss, and document their strategies, training, and progress within and/or across the age span with a special focus on how students with disabilities access the general curriculum. The teams bring together early childhood educators, elementary school staff, special education professionals, administrators, and parents to explore the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in inclusive classrooms; identify best practices to support all students along the preschool to grade 3 continuum; and prioritize areas of strength and needed improvement.

In FFY2010, grantees implemented activities to improve the number of preschool children aged 3-5 who demonstrate positive social-emotional skills, use of knowledge or skills and use of appropriate behavior to meet their needs. MASSDE believes the work of the Project has had a direct effect on the progress made in Indicator 7, particularly in the movement of students out of Progress Category A (as noted earlier, Massachusetts exhibited progress from FFY2009 to FFY2010 in this area. The improvement of assessment practices, the ability to look at the quality of instruction for children with disabilities, and the opportunity to address alignment across the age span maximizes children’s growth and learning.

- **Closing the Early Literacy Gap for Students with Disabilities (Fund Code 297).** The purpose of this competitive grant opportunity from MASSDE is to support the development of strategic literacy action plans to enhance and better align educational systems, curriculum, and instructional practices across public preschool and/or kindergarten programs, Head Start, and community-based early childhood education programs. Implementation of these strategic action plans will help to ensure that all programs serving students with disabilities, aged 3-5, are effective, engaging, developmentally appropriate, and designed to create seamless transitions across environments and into the next phase of the student’s education. District study teams assess current language and literacy strategies and practices, literacy intervention and differentiated strategies, and ways to use information from students’ Individualized Education Programs to support language and literacy across the curriculum and into the life of the school.

Similar to the preschool to grade 3 project and the professional development series, this project was designed with the goal of improving the progress that children with disabilities make in developing their early literacy skills. This has a specific connection to Outcome 2 of Indicator 7.
Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 8:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th># of Surveys Issued</th>
<th># of Surveys Returned</th>
<th>% of Surveys Returned</th>
<th># of Surveys Meeting Standard*</th>
<th>% of Surveys Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>42,034</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The standard adopted to demonstrate “that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities” requires the survey respondent to agree, strongly agree, or very strongly agree on at least 50% of the survey items (13 of 26) (13 of 26 for parents of students with disabilities in preschool through grade 6; 15 of 29 for parents of students with disabilities in middle school, high school, and post high school).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

Using a revised parent survey tool (see Appendix B) and methodology that was implemented in FFY2010, MASSDE determined that 85.9% of parents of students with disabilities responding to the Indicator 8 survey reported that schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. This result is 6 percentage points above the most recently reported FFY2008 data, and above the results for each year since the baseline was established in FFY2005, as illustrated in Graph 1 below. MASSDE met the FFY2010 measurable and rigorous target of 80%. MASSDE was able to further disaggregate the survey data and determined that 73% of parents of students with disabilities in preschool through grade 6 and 70% of parents of students with disabilities in middle school, high school, and post high school responding to the survey reported that schools
facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. This result is more than 8 percentage points above the most recently reported FFY2008 data, and above the results for each year since the baseline was established in FFY2005, as illustrated in Graph 1 below.

Since FFY2005, MASSDE consistently has exceeded its measurable and rigorous targets for Indicator 8. The percent of parents that reported schools facilitate their involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities has remained relatively stable for this period, however, increasing less than a percentage point each year, from 76% in FFY2005 to 77.3% in FFY2008, with a high of 77.5% in FFY2007. The results through FFY2008, illustrated in Table 1 below, and feedback from stakeholders and school districts about the need for changes to the survey instrument and methodology, led MASSDE to focus activities in FFY2009 and FFY2010 on survey redesign and implementation.

Table 1 – Actual Target Data for FFY2005 – FFY2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th># of Surveys Issued</th>
<th>% of Surveys Returned</th>
<th># of Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>% of Surveys Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>37,086</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40,476</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>40,307</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>4,926</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>41,192</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Redesign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 8 Parent Survey Instrument. See Appendix B.

MASSDE exceeded the target by 3 percentage points even though the FFY2010 survey demonstrated a lower return rate. Despite the lower return rate in FFY2010 (see Table 2), MASSDE considers the improved rate of parent satisfaction (see Graph 1 below) as an indication of the appropriateness of its efforts to revise and refocus the parent survey instrument and data collection processes and also as an indication to continue to present a strenuous technical assistance effort focused on the districts to raise both the response rate and the rate of surveys meeting the standard. This focused improvement activity was first described in the Massachusetts Part B Annual Performance Report (MA APR) for FFY2009 (available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/apr/APR2009_indicator8.pdf). While the return rates overall are considered statistically representative for the state, such rates at the local level rarely yielded sufficient numbers of parents responding to allow the results to be readily usable by districts to improve district partnership activities. Over the four year reporting period, district return rates ranged from less than 10% to a high of 39%, with an average return rate of 18.1%.
Research comparing response rates among online, mail, and telephone surveys suggest that response rates are typically slightly lower for online surveys than for mail or telephone surveys (Kraut et al., 2004). Further, techniques commonly used to increase response rates for mail and telephone surveys (e.g., personalizing the survey, increasing the authority of the researcher) do not seem to increase rates for online surveys (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003). Even when potential participants can be attracted to a survey, it seems difficult to get them to complete the survey. In a research study by Porter and Whitcomb (2003), of the total number of individuals who clicked the hyperlink to their survey, relatively few attempted to complete the survey. Of those that began to complete the survey, there was a high dropout rate and only a small number actually finished the survey. In the case of online surveys, the researcher has little control over the testing environment and is susceptible to increased variability in testing conditions. For example, it is difficult for researchers to control the order in which respondents complete questions in online surveys (Nosek et al., 2002). This research and further analysis of the data from FFY2010 will inform technical assistance initiatives and district outreach activities in FFY2011.
During its review of Indicator 8 data collected in FFY2010, MASSDE requested and received feedback from districts about the new data collection process that revealed additional challenges that impacted the response rate. During this first year of using the online survey, districts reported that their ability to disseminate the survey was complicated by a variety of factors, including parental lack of access to computers at home; inconsistent announcements of the survey; timing of the initial delivery of the survey in late spring; undeliverable email addresses for parents, particularly in the larger cities and towns; lack of administrative support at the district level; lack of appropriate technology and access to electronic messaging at the district level; and lack of technical support with the district’s website. Also, school districts considered the timing of the survey for the end of the school year and over the summer to be problematic in terms of districts’ ability to provide timely, frequent notices to parents regarding the survey. Although the parent satisfaction rose to higher levels than in the past, the reduced response rate suggests that improvement activities focused on increasing the response rate are necessary in order to maintain progress and increase the number of surveys meeting the standard.

In redesigning the survey and the data collection system, MASSDE and stakeholders also analyzed closely the return rates of surveys by language for each year of the SPP. FFY2010 data show that return rates were significantly lower overall, and the return rate from non-English speaking parents was particularly low. Of the total (including special education and general education parents) surveys issued in five languages in FFY2010—English, Spanish, Portuguese, Haitian Creole and Vietnamese—the overall return rates for this period reflect the difficulties associated with using an on-line survey to access a multilingual parent population, as shown in Table 2 below. The relatively low response from the multilingual community will result in MASSDE’s development of improvement activities that target this population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 8 Parent Survey.

These results overall are arguably indicative of a significant change to the Indicator 8 data collection activities, and the challenges that result initially from implementing new tools and systems. MASSDE anticipates both a better return rate and high performance results with this new system as the second and third cohorts of school districts participate in the revised Indicator 8 data collection. Each of the challenges mentioned above will be considered by MASSDE as the state engages in improvement activities in FFY2011.

**Data Analysis**

A total of 100 districts, including Boston, were included in the survey. The estimated number of parents of students with IEPs who received the survey was 42,034; the number of surveys returned was 2,289. “Response rates” for the internet-based survey were calculated based on the total estimated parent population for the cohort and not on the number of parents who actually received a parent survey. In past
years, all parents of special education students were mailed a parent survey; for this survey distribution, parents received a letter with a link to the on-line survey instrument. This resulted in lower response rates from parents of special education students compared to the average response rate seen in prior years. Because the survey dissemination process was very different this year, the “response rate” may be artificially low because all parents did not directly receive the survey.

Survey responses were analyzed and trends revealed by focusing on the items with the lowest percentages of agreement – 50% and below with a 5 point margin of error. It is important to note that the percent of agreement statistics for each survey item represent a “point estimate” of the actual percent agreement. This point estimate is used because a sample of parents responded to the survey, and not the entire population of parents of children ages 5 to 21 receiving special education services. These estimates are subject to error associated with the sample of parents who responded. Preliminary estimates of the statewide sampling error indicate that the actual percent of agreement for each item can vary by as much as 1.05 percentage points above or below the estimate. In other words, one can be 95 percent confident that an estimate of 90.0 percent agreement will actually range between 88.9 percent and 91.1 percent (that is, 90 percent plus or minus 1.1 percentage point).

Despite a lower overall response rate, the survey results provide helpful information as to how parents regard district efforts to involve them in their children’s education and the life of the school. Districts can access information regarding survey items parents responded most positively to, as well as items where parents indicated more efforts could be directed towards family engagement. Districts are expected to use that information to develop and implement activities designed to increase parent involvement and the response rate.

Although all survey items are critically important to consider, the Massachusetts Statewide Steering Committee identified the three most important survey statements that stakeholders felt were most critical to the establishment of good parent partnership. The three items and the percentage of agreement from parents of students with disabilities in FFY2010 are as follows:

- My child’s teachers give me enough time and opportunities to discuss my child’s needs and progress (survey question #4) - 80.56% of all special education parents of students with disabilities agreed with this item.
- Teachers and administrators encourage me to participate in the decision-making process (survey question #16) - 80.95% of all special education parents of students with disabilities agreed with this item.
- Teachers are available to speak with me (survey question #11) - 86.46% of all special education parents of students with disabilities agreed with this item.

83.0%85.9% of all parents of students with disabilities who responded to the survey agreed with more than half of the questions addressed to all parents. MASSDE believes that this high level of agreement with these three key statements is a very positive indication of parent partnership in Massachusetts. Additionally, more than half of all parents surveyed agreed with 21 of the 25 survey items.

MASSDE further analyzed the survey responses to determine trends in items that generated lower rates of agreement. Analysis of the response rate and the trends of the responses indicated a need to develop an improvement activity designed to provide technical assistance to districts on increasing their outreach efforts to increase the response rate by more actively engaging parents, which should lead to higher percentages of parents completing the survey as well as enhancing parent engagement overall. In general, analysis underscores the importance of MASSDE’s work in providing information and supports in the areas of early childhood transition (Indicator 12) and secondary transition (Indicator 13). The response data will be used to inform activities in these areas.

Responses were disaggregated into two groups - early childhood/elementary and middle/high school/post high school. More parents of elementary students with disabilities responded to the survey. At the early
childhood and elementary level, five of the nine survey items received 73% or more of parent agreement. At the middle, high school and post high school level, six of the 12 survey items received 70% of parent agreement. Both levels illustrated issues with transition (from and IFSP to an IEP, and from high school to post high school) as most problematic. Other concerns expressed in survey results pertain to training offered to parents of students with disabilities.

The three survey questions that demonstrate these two trends at the early childhood/elementary level were:

- My child’s school invites parents to attend training sessions relating to the needs of children with disabilities and their families. (51.1% agreement in general. Parents of students in separate schools reported more training opportunities than for other placements.)
- I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities. (51.6% agreement in general. Parents of students in separate schools reported more information was provided than for other placements.)
- The district had supports in place to assist me and my child as my child moved from an IFSP to an IEP. (40.8% agreement. Parents of students in separate schools reported more supports were provided than for other placements.)

Similarly, the results of the analysis of the three survey questions from the middle/high school/post high school responses were:

- My child’s school invites parents to attend training sessions relating to the needs of children with disabilities and their families. (52.4% agreement in general. Parents of students in full inclusion reported more agreement with this item.)
- I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities. (51.1% agreement. Parents with students in separate classrooms reported more agreement with this item.)
- The school staff provides information on community resources that can assist my child in the transition from school to adult life. (38.8% agreement in general. Parents with students in a separate school reported more agreement with this item.)

**Improvemen Activities**

MASSDE engaged in several improvement activities in FFY2010 that were aligned with the survey redesign and implementation activities in addition to survey development and data analysis activities discussed above and in the MA SPP. In this reporting year, MASSDE held two webinars with administrators from the 100 school districts participating in the cohort data collection to train them on the instrument itself, proper data collection methods, and ways to increase parental response rates. The webinars focused on how to reach parents in order to encourage more parents to take the survey. Participating districts placed the survey access information on their websites; conducted electronic announcements (via phone and email); made work stations available to parents to allow them to complete the survey at the school; and posted survey access information at various places in the schools, district and community; and received appropriate assistance from MASSDE to put these practices in place.

Additional activities were focused on supporting educators in facilitating parent involvement. Some of the following activities that address multiple indicator areas are described in Appendix A. Please note that only the components that directly relate to Indicator 8 are included below.

- MASSDE provides a variety of online resources for parents and educators. The “Parent’s Rights in Special Education” online module ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/training.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/training.html)) gives districts and Parent Advisory Councils materials to use in leading annual workshops on the state
and federal special education laws and regulations. In addition, the “Parent Information” section of the MASSDE special education website (http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/parents.html) offers a variety of resources for parents and educators, including the "Parent’s Guide to Special Education." This technical assistance document, which was written in collaboration with the Federation for Children with Special Needs, the Massachusetts Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), continues to be used by parents and district personnel to provide information on the special education process to parents and schools.

- MASSDE has developed a **Resource Toolkit on Parent Involvement** that will be disseminated to the districts. The Family Engagement Resource Toolkit contains resources, promising practices, research into parent involvement and the impact on student achievement, how to engage with parents of different cultures and languages, and barriers to parent involvement.

- MASSDE has developed a **Facilitating Family Engagement** grant, the purpose of which is to provide funds to support districts’ efforts to use data obtained from the Parent Involvement Survey to improve services and results for children with disabilities. The aim of the grant is to provide high quality parent involvement activities, staff professional development, or parent leadership training.

- Since transition from Early Intervention and transition into adulthood were cited as concerns by parents MASSDE will focus on developing technical assistance on the website and through webinars for districts around both issues. MASSDE will develop an ongoing **Parent Involvement Interest Group** as a means of designing and delivering specific training needs. Interest Group activities will be supplemented by LEA participation in designing and disseminating best practices to engage families and parents.

- MASSDE provided **webinars** to school and district personnel that were focused on increasing parental response and using the data from the new survey to create meaningful, sustainable changes in process involving parents. Some of the suggestions were:
  - Put the link and announcement on your website (home page and special education page)
  - Send announcement and link home with students – backpacks
  - Post announcement and link at the front entrance of each school, in public buildings, and at school events
  - Participate in PAC/PTO community activities; administrative buy-in
  - Utilize district electronic messaging/phone system to remind parents to do the survey
  - Provide computers in each school for parents to use
  - Post notice and link in public buildings and school events
  - Ask school volunteers to call parents to remind them about the survey
  - Continue emailing all of your parents about the survey (According to current research do not send more than two reminder emails); remind parents that the results of the survey will be reported
  - Utilize your district’s electronic messaging system to remind parents to use the survey
  - Put an announcement about the survey on your website
  - Send a letter or postcard to every family with children in the schools encouraging them to take the survey and providing them with the link
  - Provide a notice of the survey when new students enroll in the schools
  - Discuss the survey and its’ positive implications for improved parent involvement at School Committee/School Board meetings
  - Place an announcement on the local community TV channel
  - Put a notice in the local newspaper; give a short interview about the nature and purpose of the survey
  - Discuss the survey in the superintendent’s blog

- Through MASSDE’s federal State Personnel Development Grant, known as **Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA)**, MASSDE offered two online courses annually in the area of family involvement. These courses are designed to equip educators with the knowledge and skills
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required to develop and strengthen collaborative partnerships with families of middle and high school students with disabilities, to assist students to successfully transition to adult life. In FFY2010, these courses continued to attract district administrators, teachers, and other professionals seeking to improve their skills at engaging parents.

- MASSDE has a long-standing Collaboration with the Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN), the federally-funded Parent Training and Information Center. This year’s jointly sponsored workshops for parents included sessions on Basic Rights in Special Education, Celebrate Yourself! Self-Determination and Successful Students Creating a Vision; Effective Communication and the IEP; An IEP for My Child; MCAS – Access and Achievement for Students with Disabilities; Suspension & Discipline in Special Education; Transition 101 – High School to Adulthood; Turning Three Essentials; Understanding My Child’s Learning Style; and 504 Plans. The Federation provides individualized practical information related to education law, advocacy, workshops, community resources, school programs, disability information, and other areas of concern as well as a variety of workshops in local communities on educational rights and issues, advocacy and collaboration. A comprehensive advocacy training program is available for those who wish to assist parents with special education issues. All resources are provided in Spanish or Portuguese and are free.

- MASSDE’s Special Education Advisory Council (SAC) is a group of parents and professionals charged under federal and state special education laws to provide policy guidance to MASSDE on issues affecting special education and related services for students with disabilities within the Commonwealth. The SAC has expressed a particular interest in parent involvement and in activities designed to raise the response rate to the survey and to enhance activities in the LEAs. The SAC’s responsibilities include:
  - advising MASSDE on unmet needs within the state in the education of students with disabilities;
  - providing public comment on proposed rules and regulations for special education;
  - advising MASSDE on developing evaluations and corrective action plans; and
  - advising MASSDE in planning the coordination of services to students with disabilities.

- The Statewide Special Education Steering Committee is an active group of stakeholders from across disciplines, including parents, educators, administrators, advocates, and agency representatives who meet annually to, among other things, review baseline and current data (618 data and monitoring data), identify areas in need of attention, and plan for improvement activities. The Steering Committee has expressed a specific interest in parent involvement and a commitment to improvement outreach efforts across the state.

- The purpose of the competitive grant opportunity entitled Closing the Early Literacy Gap for Students with Disabilities (Fund Code 297) is to support the development of strategic literacy action plans to enhance and better align educational systems, curriculum, and instructional practices across public preschool and/or kindergarten programs, Head Start, and community-based early childhood education programs. The implementation of the strategic action plans help to ensure that all programs serving students with disabilities, aged 3 to 5, are effective, engaging, developmentally appropriate, and designed to create seamless transitions across environments and into the next phase of the student’s education. Fifty-seven districts have participated in the grant program. Each of the twenty-eight districts across the state that were awarded grants designed school and community-based actions plans to implement activities to facilitate parent involvement as a way to improve results for students with disabilities. In the fall of 2010, these districts had the opportunity to apply for further funding to assist in implementing their plans. The districts’ Early Literacy Action Plans reveal an emphasis on including parents in literacy and school-based activities and provide a plethora of creative activities and use of research-based curriculum materials that foster early literacy. The grant projects also focus on collaborating with community agencies including Head Start. MASSDE plans to continue and expand this grant program.
The Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA) was created to meet the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach students with moderate disabilities or students who are English language learners by assisting teachers with waivers to earn licensure. MLA courses are delivered through the Massachusetts Online Network for Education (MassONE) and have at least one face-to-face session. MLA courses contain activities and resources focused on parent involvement.

The Preschool to Grade 3 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Alignment Project (Fund Code 264A & 264B) is designed to identify and support strategies and resources to increase districts’ capacity to improve the quality of education and inclusion of children with disabilities by aligning and coordinating curriculum, instruction, and assessment from Preschool to Grade 3. In several districts funds were allocated towards activities that facilitate parent involvement. Teams in the continuation year (264B) implement two to three strategies that have been identified during the planning year as a means of strengthening inclusion practices and building a continuum in the early elementary grades. FFY2010 was the final year of funding for Fund Code 264B; best practices and outcomes will be reported and disseminated statewide. Forty-seven districts participated in the program.

Massachusetts school districts allocated funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) - IDEA to a variety of activities designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

MASSDE holds an annual Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summit to share resources for strengthening curriculum, instruction, and assessment; identify needs for future development of curriculum resources and technical assistance; and build capacity of the MASSDE, districts, and schools through regional partnerships.

In FFY2009, MASSDE and the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (MEEC) co-sponsored two training series and a Special Education Professional Development Summer Institute for public preschool and kindergarten staff and other early childhood professionals working in programs that serve young students with disabilities. The series’ offered two training days focused on strengthening knowledge and skills of administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals. The first series addressed inclusion of young children with a diagnosis on the Autism Spectrum. The second focused on issues related to behavioral health and ways to address challenging behaviors in order to create meaningful inclusive opportunities for children with disabilities. The two agencies continue to work together to provide high-quality training for professionals and produced a conference titled Brain Building and Early Literacy and Numeracy: Strategies and Supports for Young Children (Birth to 8). One conference session focused specifically on parent involvement.

The Federal School Turnaround grants are for states to use to assist the lowest performing schools. Districts with one or more Level 4 (underperforming) schools are eligible to apply. MASSDE awards grants based on the plans districts develop under Chapter 12 of the Acts of 2010, An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap. Districts applying for the grants are required to choose one of four prescribed intervention models and demonstrate capacity to implement that model effectively over three years. The four models are: Turnaround, Transformation Close/Consolidate, and Restart. Districts continue to use grant funds for many activities including parent involvement.

Section 19 of Chapter 321 of the Acts of 2008 required the creation of the Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools. Since January 2009, the Task Force worked to create a framework for supportive school environments, and developed a self-assessment tool to improve educational outcomes for students with behavioral health needs and to assist school environments in fostering effective collaboration with community based behavioral health providers. The framework addresses areas such as school leadership, professional
development, access to behavioral health services, effective academic and non-academic supports, family engagement, and referral policies and protocols.

- As part of the Special Education Summer Institute, MASSDE annually provides two **Special Education Leadership Academies**. The academies provide opportunities for school district special education administrators to develop new leadership skills and to improve current skills. Academy I is open to administrators who have 1-5 years of experience; Academy II is for administrators with more than 5 years of experience.

- **Special Education Summer Institutes** are statewide professional development opportunities provided free of charge to special education professionals. Sponsored by MASSDE in partnership with school districts, educational collaboratives, institutions of higher education, and professional associations, the Institutes are designed to support efforts of approved private special education schools, educational collaboratives, and local school districts to increase the quality of programs and services provided to students with disabilities, and increase the number of highly qualified educators working in the field of special education. MASSDE’s Special Education Planning and Policy unit (SEPP) collaborates with the MASSDE Office of Curriculum and Instruction to provide professional development institutes in specific curriculum content areas. An especially pertinent offering is *Assessing English Language Learners (ELL) with Disabilities*.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2011-2012):**

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) has been revised to include information about the revised parent survey instrument and methodology implemented in FFY2010, and new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**Indicator 9:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Measurement:**

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

**State’s definition of “disproportionate representation”:**

Massachusetts defines “disproportionate representation” using a calculation of weighted or alternate risk ratio and a review of the appropriateness of a district’s policies, procedures, and practices for identifying students as disabled.

MASSDE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for each school district using the techniques described in detail in Westat’s *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education* [http://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf]. The state uses a minimum cell size of 20 for each race/ethnic group in every district. Cells less than 20 are individually reviewed to see if data irregularities for specific racial and ethnic groups in these districts would suggest disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. Once the calculation is made for each district, the weighted risk ratios are compared to the two previous years’ weighted risk ratios. Districts are flagged if for 3 consecutive years, they exhibit a weighted risk ratio of 3.0 or greater for possible over-representation, or of .25 or less for possible under-representation.

All districts identified by way of this quantitative analysis are then subject to a review of the appropriateness of their policies, practices, and procedures (PPPs) for special education eligibility determination and disability identification.

**Description of determination that disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification:**

A district identified using the measurement techniques described above submits its current PPPs to MASSDE where they are reviewed by a single analyst. If the single analyst concluded that the PPPs were inappropriate or otherwise inconsistent with federal and state regulations, and concludes that the PPPs likely caused the disproportionate representation at least to some degree, then a district is identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Districts</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups that was the Result of Inappropriate Identification</th>
<th>Percent of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

Massachusetts determines a district has disproportionate representation if, for three consecutive years, a district exhibits a weighted or alternative risk ratio of 3.0 or greater for possible over-representation or 0.25 or less for possible under-representation. A district that meets those thresholds is then subject to MASSDE’s review of the district’s policies, practices and procedures to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Massachusetts used the October 1, 2010 enrollment and child count data to calculate disproportionality in the FFY2010 APR. In this reporting period, no districts were excluded from the numerator as a result of the minimum n size requirement; all 393 districts were included in the denominator. Using the measurement criteria described above, MASSDE determined that 0 out of 393 districts met the data threshold for disproportionate over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and 0 out of 393 districts met the data threshold for disproportionate under-representation. Therefore, MASSDE determined that 0.0% of the districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups that was due to inappropriate identification. MASSDE met its measurable and rigorous target.

Improvement Activities

MASSDE continues to review and refine the formula for calculating disproportionality. Last year, MASSDE submitted a proposal to OSEP that incorporated into the disproportionality calculation special consideration for the number of students who were initially evaluated and found eligible for special education services in a district other than the one in which they are currently enrolled. Although the methodology was not approved as written in FFY2009, in the current reporting year MASSDE continued to analyze ways to revise the methodology for Indicator 9 that would appropriately incorporate the variable.

Additionally, MASSDE has examined other avenues to address disproportionately in special education by updating the definition of significant disproportionality that triggers the requirement for a school district to reserve 15% of its special education funds for early intervening services. The definition now includes the following language:

"Any district with a weighted risk ratio or alternative risk ratio for special education identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, exceeding 5.0 for four consecutive years, and whose risk ratio or alternative risk ratio is growing more disproportionate (i.e. becoming more and more over-represented) in each of those four years, and during those four years, initially evaluated and found students eligible for services at a rate higher than the state median." (Emphasis added.)

To explore further the topic of how district transfer can affect disproportionality determinations for school districts, MASSDE reached out to districts flagged for disproportionate representation in a specific
disability (Indicator 10) – a majority of which were vocational technical school districts – to better understand the complexity of disproportionality and the rate of initial evaluations. Of the eight districts contacted, five explained that the majority of their special education population entered its district with an existing diagnosis and an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). These claims support MASSDE’s decision to update the definition of significant disproportionality that affects reservation of funds.

In support of efforts to strengthen the communications with and input from stakeholders, members of the stakeholder group were invited to a focus group session about this Indicator. Their input is being evaluated and will be incorporated into future activities regarding disproportionality in special education.

Disproportionality information on the MASSDE’s public website is being updated to include FFY2010 information (see http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx). Through this website a user can select a specific district to access data on Indicator 9.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

**Indicator 10:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

\[(20 \text{ U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C)}\]

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

**State’s definition of “disproportionate representation”:**
Massachusetts defines “disproportionate representation” using a calculation of weighted or alternate risk ratio and a review of the appropriateness of a district’s policies, practices, and procedures for identifying students as disabled.

MASSDE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for every school district in each of the six required disability categories (intellectual impairments, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech/language impairments, other health impairments, autism) using the techniques described in Westat’s *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education* (http://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf). The state uses a minimum cell size of 10 for each racial/ethnic disability group in every district. Cells less than 10 are individually reviewed to see if data irregularities for specific racial and ethnic groups in these districts would suggest disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. Once the calculation is made for each district, the weighted risk ratios are compared to the two previous years’ weighted risk ratios. Districts are flagged if for 3 consecutive years, they exhibit a weighted risk ratio of 4.0 or greater for possible over-representation, or of .20 or less for possible under-representation.

All districts identified by way of this quantitative analysis are then subject to a review of the appropriateness of their policies, practices, and procedures (PPPs) for special education eligibility determination and disability identification.

**Description of determination that disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification:**
A district identified using the measurement techniques described above submits its current PPPs to MASSDE where they are reviewed by a single analyst. If the single analyst concludes that the PPPs were inappropriate or otherwise inconsistent with federal and state regulations, and concludes that the PPPs likely caused the disproportionate representation at least to some degree, then a district is identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories That Was the Result of Inappropriate Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Districts</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Specific Disability Categories That Was the Result of Inappropriate Identification</th>
<th>Percent of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

Massachusetts determines a district has disproportionate representation if, for three consecutive years, a district exhibits a weighted or alternative risk ratio of 4.0 or greater for possible over-representation or 0.20 or less for possible under-representation. A district that meets those thresholds is then subject to a review of its policies, practices, and procedures to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Massachusetts used the October 1, 2010 enrollment and child count data to calculate disproportionality in this reporting period. In FFY2010, 33 out of 393 districts were excluded from the numerator as a result of the minimum n size requirement; all 393 districts were included in the denominator. Using the measurement criteria established above, MASSDE determined that 15 districts met the data threshold for disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in the six disability categories. Of these, 8 were identified for over-representation and 7 for under-representation. Upon additional review of policies, practices, and procedures using the process described above, MASSDE determined that 0.0% of the districts had disproportionate over- or under-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was due to inappropriate identification. In FFY 2010, MASSDE met its measurable and rigorous target.

Improvement Activities

MASSDE continues to review and refine the formula for calculating disproportionality. Last year, MASSDE submitted a proposal to OSEP that incorporated into the disproportionality calculation special consideration for the number of students who were initially evaluated and found eligible for special education services in a district other than the one in which they are currently enrolled. Although the methodology was not approved as written in FFY2009, in the current reporting year MASSDE continued to analyze ways to revise the methodology for that would appropriately incorporate the variable.

Additionally, MASSDE has examined other avenues to address disproportionately in special education by updating the definition of significant disproportionality that triggers the requirement for a school district to reserve 15% of its special education funds for early intervening services. The definition now includes the following language:

"Any district with a weighted risk ratio or alternative risk ratio for special education identification, placement, and disciplinary actions, exceeding 5.0 for four consecutive years, and whose risk ratio or alternative risk ratio is growing more disproportionate (i.e. ...
becoming more and more over-represented) in each of those four years, and during those four years, initially evaluated and found students eligible for services at a rate higher than the state median.” (Emphasis added.)

To explore further the topic of how district transfer can affect disproportionality determinations for school districts, MASSDE reached out to districts flagged for disproportionate representation in a specific disability – a majority of which were vocational technical school districts – to better understand the complexity of disproportionality and the rate of initial evaluations. Of the eight districts contacted, five explained that the majority of their special education population entered its district with an existing diagnosis and an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). These claims support MASSDE’s decision to update the definition of significant disproportionality that affects reservation of funds.

In support of efforts to strengthen the communications with and input from stakeholders, members of the stakeholder group were invited to a focus group session about this Indicator. Their input is being evaluated and will be incorporated into future activities regarding disproportionality in special education

Disproportionality information on the MASSDE’s public website is being updated to include FFY2010 information (see http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx). Through this website a user can select a specific district to access data on Indicator 10.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received 3237

b. Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timelines) 3069

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established-timeline)

Percent = [3069 divided by 3237] times 100.

94.8%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY2010:

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The FFY2010 data is based on a cohort of 89 school districts reporting on initial evaluations that were begun in the months of October, November, and December, 2010. Data collection procedures are described in the Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP). If a student’s evaluation was complete and the eligibility determination was made by the Team within 45 school working days, consistent with the state-established timeline (see 603 CMR 28.05(1)), the evaluation was deemed timely and in compliance.

During the FFY2010 data period, cohort school districts received parental consent for initial evaluation for 3,237 students. Of those, 3,029 students’ evaluations, or 94.8%, were completed timely. While this is a decrease of two percentage points over the FFY2009 actual target data, it is not significant slippage and is a reasonable variation between different cohorts. Of note is an 18% increase in the number of children
for whom parental consent to evaluated was received in FFY2010 (3,237) compared to FFY2009 (2,744).
The data for the SPP period to date is represented in Graph 1 below:

Graph 1:

![Graph 1: Children Evaluated Within State-established Timeline](image)

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

In FFY2010, there were 168 students in the cohort districts for whom initial evaluations were not completed timely. On average, those delayed evaluations exceeded the state-established timeline by 14 school working days. This is an improvement over last year, where the average delay was 17 school working days.

Of the 3,327 initial evaluations completed, 1,921 students, or 59%, were deemed to be eligible for special education services. Of those evaluations 1,830, or approximately 95%, were completed within the state-established timeline or a timeline that was appropriately extended.

In certain circumstances, namely those beyond the districts' control, MASSDE has determined that delays beyond the 45 school working day requirement for evaluation are “acceptable” and do not result in noncompliance. Such reasons include: delay due to school closure of weather or unanticipated emergency, parent scheduling need or parent missing a scheduled meeting, extended student absence or student illness, and evaluation extended with agreement of the parents. Any reason for delay that is attributable to a matter within the district’s control is determined to be an unacceptable reason to extend the established timeframe for initial evaluation. As illustrated in Table 1 below, in FFY2010 school districts most often claimed that unavailability of staff to complete evaluations was the reason for missing the state-established timeline.
Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for District Delay in Meeting Timelines (matters within Districts’ control)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient staff availability to complete the evaluation on time (excessive caseload)</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay due to district’s scheduling need or conflict</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay due to evaluator reports not received on time</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay due to lack of qualified staff to complete the evaluation on time</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other” (e.g., need for bilingual evaluator)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

The reasons given in FFY2009 and FFY2010 for not being able to conduct evaluations in a timely manner are similar. In FFY2009, districts cited in 41% of cases that delays were due to “insufficient staff” or “excessive caseload.” This was the primary reason for delay in FFY2010, cited by school districts in 47.6% of “unacceptable” delays. In FFY2010, school districts reported that insufficient staff, scheduling conflicts, lack of qualified staff, and evaluator reports not received on time accounted for 80.9% of missed timelines. The increase in the frequency delays were caused by insufficient staff may be due to districts continuing to struggle with limited financial resources. MASSDE does not accept limited staffing resources as justification for noncompliance, however, and will continue to work with school districts to ensure that students’ needs are met timely. MASSDE remains committed to assisting school districts to make progress toward meeting the state’s measurable and rigorous target, and will continue to work with school districts to determine the root cause for the delays so that targeted improvement activities can be more closely assigned to causal factors.

**Improvement Activities**

**Verification of Correction of Noncompliance**

In FFY2009, MASSDE reported a compliance rate of 96.8%. Six districts in that data collection cohort received a letter of finding of noncompliance in December, 2010. With this finding, MASSDE notified districts that they were required to complete corrective actions as soon as possible, but in no case more than one year from identification, consistent with the identification and verification of correction of noncompliance requirements in OSEP Memorandum 09-02. MASSDE required each district to (1) submit additional data demonstrating that the district completed, though late, the evaluation of any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the student was no longer within the district’s jurisdiction; (2) review its practices, procedures, and policies and revise them as necessary to ensure that they did not present barriers to timely completion of initial evaluations and eligibility determination in the future; and (3) to complete the second prong of correction identified in OSEP Memorandum 09-02, submit a subsequent data set on initial evaluations that demonstrated compliance with the requirements for timely initial evaluation. MASSDE reviewed the data to verify correction of identified noncompliance, and notified each district by letter in September, 2011 that identified noncompliance was resolved within one year of identification. Based on its review of supplemental data and information submitted by school districts, MASSDE has determined that there is no outstanding noncompliance identified in FFY2009, and has notified districts of this determination.

As of the date of this report, MASSDE has not issued findings of noncompliance to five school districts, based on FFY2010 data. Districts will be notified of their noncompliance status in February 2012.
and MASSDE will work with them to ensure that noncompliance is corrected no later than one year after the finding was made. The results of these activities will be reported in the FFY2011 APR.

**Additional Improvement Activities**

During FFY2010, MASSDE focused activities on assisting districts in meeting required timelines for completion of initial evaluations in compliance with established timelines.

MASSDE is in the process of developing a **SMARTFORM for data collection** that will assist districts in identifying barriers to meeting state established timelines for initial evaluations. This automated form will include dropdown menus which incorporate most frequent reasons given by school districts in the past. This will minimize errors in data input and tabulation and will also allow districts to identify more easily the issues contributing to noncompliance.

Improvement activities also focused on professional development, with the goal of providing special education administrators and school district professionals with the resources to effect systemic change for compliance, including Indicator 11. Appendix A includes complete descriptions of the following activities:

- **Collaboration with Stakeholders.** The Special Education Advisory Council (SAC) is a group of parents and professionals charged by federal and state law to provide policy guidance on issues affecting the education of students with disabilities. These responsibilities include advising MASSDE on unmet needs and developing corrective action plans. Additionally, the State Special Education Steering Committee, consisting of parents, educators, administrators, advocates, and agency representatives meet annually to review baseline data, identify areas of need, and plan improvement activities.

- **Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Training Project (CSPD).** This is a series of training activities developed by MASSDE to supplement personnel development activities provided within school districts. Through the CSPD training modules, MASSDE provides professional development in the form of PowerPoint presentations and supplemental handouts. Topics that address the timeline requirements of initial evaluations and child find obligations include:
  - *The Massachusetts IEP Process*
  - *A Principal’s Role and Special Education in Massachusetts*
  - *Is Special Education the Right Service?*

- **Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA)** courses that were created to address the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach students with moderate disabilities or students who are English language learners. In school districts where noncompliance was reported in FFY2010, a lack of adequate staff was cited increasingly as a reason for not being able to complete initial evaluations in accordance with state established timelines. MASSDE is committed to increasing the number of licensed educators teaching students with moderate disabilities in grades PreK-12. MASSDE believes that increasing the number of teachers qualified to teach children with moderate special needs will improve compliance with child find obligations and required timelines for initial evaluations. These courses are provided to all currently employed teachers who are either teaching under a waiver or who are eligible for waivers. MLA courses are delivered through the Massachusetts Online Network for Education (Mass One). Offering courses on-line with only one required meeting increases the access of teachers statewide. The MLA began in 2009 and when completed, will include nine (9) three credit, graduate level courses that will assist teachers to obtain certification in Teaching children with Moderate Special Needs.

- **Revision of “Ten Step guide for Comprehensive Educational Assessment of Students with Visual Impairments.”** Members of the Vision Impairment Disability Workgroup, working with other experts in the field of diagnosis, treatment, education, and training of students with visual impairments, have collaborated to revise the Guide to reflect updated regulatory information.
concerning best practices. The revised guide includes a new section describing the characteristics of a vision loss, and has been reformatted for use as a web based resource. The Guide recommends types of assessments that should be utilized in evaluating children and making eligibility determinations. MASSDE hopes that this resource will expedite the evaluation process for children with visual impairments.

- **Special Education Leadership Academies and Seminars.** As part of the Special Education Summer Institute, MASSDE annually provides two Special Education Leadership Academies. The academies provide opportunities for school district special education administrators to develop and improve skills. MASSDE believes that providing administrators with increased knowledge and skill support will improve compliance with mandated timelines for initial evaluation of children. Academies provide professional development to administrators in the following areas:
  
  - effective leadership in compliance with state and federal laws and regulations;
  - fiscal administration;
  - data collection and analysis;
  - staff recruitment and retention;
  - instructional program design and improvement; and
  - access to the general curriculum based on the *Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.

MASSDE sponsors ongoing seminars for former participants of the Leadership Academies. This enables special education administrators to connect and share effective practices, policies, strategies, and products.

- **The Special Education Professional Development Summer Institutes** sponsored by MASSDE are provided free of charge to special education professionals. Institutes are designed to support approved private special education schools, educational collaboratives, and local school districts to increase the quality of programs and services provided to students with disabilities, and increase the number of highly qualified educators working in the field of special education. To specifically address the requirement of timely initial evaluations MASSDE offers the courses *Assessing English Language Learners (ELL) with Disabilities* and *Collaborative Evaluation* led by local evaluators.

MASSDE has continued to publicly report initial evaluation timelines data. This information, which is in the process of being updated, is available at: [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

The Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Measurement:

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination = 397 366
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays = 63 69
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays = 232 186
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services = 26 49
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays = 19 32

Percent = [(232 186) divided by (397 366 - 63 69 - 26 49 - 19 32) X 100] = 80.3% 86.1%
For the FFY2010 reporting year, 80.3% 86.1% of the students eligible for special education services received those services on or before their third birthday. States are also required to indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays, for children included in (a) but not included in (b), (c), (d) or (e). MASSDE reviewed data from each of the participating districts to determine the range of days beyond the child’s third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP was developed, and the reasons for reported delay.

Seven districts reported that eligible students received services less than ten days after the students’ third birthday; 19 districts reported that students received services between 11-31 days after the third birthday; 15 districts reported that eligible students received services more than 31 days past the third birthday; and 35 districts reported that all eligible students received services before their third birthday.

In 168 cases eligibility was determined and the IEP was implemented after the child’s third birthday:

- no more than 10 days after the child’s third birthday – 29.7% (62 individual cases)
- more than 10 days but less than one month after the child’s third birthday – 21.2% (44 individual cases)
- more than one month after the child’s third birthday – 29.7% (62 individual cases)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2009-2010):**

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage**

In FFY2010, Massachusetts’ performance on Indicator 12 was 80.3% 86.1%, indicating slippage from the FFY2009 rate of 94%. Based on its analysis of these results and responses received from cohort school districts, MASSDE opines that the most significant reasons for slippage in meeting timelines for Part C to Part B transition are related to personnel issues such as vacancies, insufficient number of positions, staff scheduling problems, extreme weather conditions (many school closure days due to snow), and State level turnover. Since Massachusetts collects data through a cohort model, differences between cohort compositions also need to be taken into account. Based on the FFY2010 results, MASSDE recognizes that there is a continuing need for training and technical assistance to improve data collection and compliance.

**Improvement Activities**

**Correction of Noncompliance**

Because MASSDE reported less than 100% compliance in FFY2009, OSEP instructed MASSDE to report on the verification of correction of noncompliance identified using FFY2009 data, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In February, 2011, MASSDE notified districts of noncompliance based on FFY2009 data submissions. In its notice of noncompliance, MASSDE instructs districts on its 4-step correction process. To demonstrate correction of identified noncompliance, districts must (1) review and amend policies, procedures, and practices to insure that the school districts are implementing 34 CFR § 300.124(b) correctly; (2) submit revised practices to MASSDE for review; (3) submit to MASSDE updated data to demonstrate correct implementation of the regulations; and (4) submit student-specific records demonstrating that the districts have developed and implemented the students’ IEPs, although late, for all children for whom implementation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the districts’ jurisdiction. MASSDE then provides written notice of acceptance of correction, if so determined. During the verification period, MASSDE provides technical assistance to school districts through teleconferences and other training sessions regarding verification activities. This expanded process is consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

There remains a single district that has not completed correction activities and for which noncompliance was identified. Because of the requirement to correct noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year after identification, this district has until February 22, 2012, the data on which MASSDE notified it of the noncompliance, to complete its correction activities. MASSDE will report on this during the FFY2010 revision period in April. A single district received a finding of noncompliance under Indicator 12 in FFY2009. MASSDE has determined through review of subsequent data that the district
has completed the required evaluation and developed and implemented the IEP for each child who has been found eligible for Part B, though late, unless the child is no longer within the district’s jurisdiction. Also, MASSDE has reviewed a series of corrective action reports submitted by the district to support the district’s efforts to amend policies, procedures, practices and ensure that they are being implemented consistent with the regulatory requirements for Part C to Part B transition. The district has not submitted updated data that demonstrates that it is implementing the specific regulatory requirements correctly, and so the finding from FFY2009 remains open.

The district also submitted data during the FFY2010 Indicator 12 data collection period. Although the district improved its rate of compliance in this reporting period, and fewer students reported in this data set were affected by the noncompliance with the timeline requirement, the results of this review are being incorporated into the open finding from FFY2009. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, MASSDE is requiring the district to submit additional data sets to verify that the noncompliance identified in FFY2010 has been remedied, including for the individual students affected, and also to engage in a corrective action process to review and amend policies, practices, and procedures to address the root causes of the district’s noncompliance, which include staffing and program availability. MASSDE will report on the status of verification of correction of noncompliance activities from FFY2009 and FFY2010 in the FFY2011 APR.

Additional Improvement Activities

In FFY2010, MASSDE (or its sister agency, the Department of Early Education and Care) engaged in a number of intra-agency and inter-agency activities and initiatives to support appropriate transition for children from Part C to Part B. The role of MASSDE’s Special Education Planning and Policy (SEPP) unit in the planning and implementation stages of these activities has helped to ensure that the needs of students with disabilities are addressed. See Appendix A for more information about the activities that affect work in more than one indicator area.

- **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) - IDEA.** In year two of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Massachusetts school districts allocated funds to a variety of activities designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Many of the districts’ initiatives for 2009-2010 were continuation activities from the first year of ARRA.

- **Preschool to Grade 3 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Alignment Project (Fund Code 264A & 264B).** The purpose of this three-year grant program is to identify and support strategies and resources to increase districts’ capacity to improve the quality of education and inclusion of children with disabilities by aligning and coordinating curriculum, instruction, and assessment from Preschool to Grade 3. Planning grantees (264A) research, discuss and document their strategies, training, and progress within and/or across the age span, with a focus on how students with disabilities access the general curriculum. The teams bring together early childhood educators, elementary school staff, special education professionals, administrators, and parents to explore the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in inclusive classrooms; identify best practices to support all students along the pre-K to grade 3 continuum; and prioritize areas of strength and needed improvement. Teams in the continuation year (264B) implement strategies that have been identified during the planning year as a means of strengthening inclusion practices and building a continuum in the early elementary grades. FFY2010 was the final year of funding for Fund Code 264B; best practices and outcomes will be reported and disseminated statewide. Forty-seven districts participated in the program.

- **Closing the Early Literacy Gap for Students with Disabilities (Fund Code 297).** The purpose of the competitively awarded grant is to support the development of strategic literacy action plans to enhance and better align educational systems, curriculum, and instructional practices across public preschool and/or kindergarten programs, Head Start, and community-based early childhood education programs. These strategic action plans will help to ensure that all programs serving students with disabilities, aged 3 to 5, are effective, engaging, developmentally appropriate, and are designed to create seamless transitions across environments and into the
next phase of the student’s education. Fifty-seven districts across the state have been awarded grants. In FFY 2010, all of the grantee districts implemented school and community-based activities to support effective transitions into and out of preschool. The state is planning to continue this project since the response has been high.

- **MASSDE’s Special Education Advisory Council (SAC)** is a group of parents and professionals charged under federal and state special education laws to provide policy guidance to MASSDE on issues affecting special education and related services for students with disabilities within the Commonwealth. The SAC has expressed a particular interest in professional development and activities that strengthen districts’ expertise in transitions between early Intervention and special education.

- The **Statewide Special Education Steering Committee** is an active group of stakeholders from across disciplines, including parents, educators, administrators, advocates, and agency representatives who meet annually to, among other things, review baseline and current data (618 data and monitoring data), identify areas in need of attention, and plan for improvement activities. The Steering Committee has expressed a specific interest in professional development for Early Intervention and school districts regarding best practices for transition into special education.

- **Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care.** MEEC sponsors the Communities of Practice series related to young children’s needs. In May 2011 the topics presented were: Supporting Children At Risk for Challenging Behaviors; Communication to Support Children, Families and Programs; and Building Connections to Support Children and Parents through Multiple Transitions, Including Termination. These sessions were available at no cost to the early childhood provider community; participants included representatives from child care organizations, Head Start, Coordinated Family Community Engagement grantees, Early Intervention (EI) providers, school districts, and state agencies. The key concepts focused on strengthening collaboration and sharing resources or ideas as they relate to supporting young children and families, including children with disabilities. Participants were encouraged to network and share best practices and strengths/concerns with each other, and to brainstorm ways to continue this work in their programs and community. The next series will focus on the inclusive classroom.

- **MASSDE, MEEC and the Massachusetts Department of Public Health** continue to work together to support EI and school districts in establishing relationships and develop local Memoranda of Understanding to facilitate smooth transitions for families. The Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) and the Institute for Education and Professional Development (IEPD) facilitated a new course on the Early Learning Guidelines for Infants Toddlers. The course, Incorporating the MA Early Learning Guidelines for Infants Toddlers into your Program, was offered through the University of Massachusetts - Boston. Educators took the course for self-study and facilitated study to obtain (CEUs) or for college credit through Westfield State University. The self-study guide for each course provided each participant with an overview of the Early Learning Guidelines for Infants and Toddlers. A series of regional trainings for school districts and EI providers has been developed for the spring of 2012.

- **MEEC continues to collaborate with MASSDE’s Program Quality Assurance (PQA) unit on annual scheduled compliance reviews.** MEEC participates as a member of the PQA monitoring teams that visit school districts that as part of the six-year monitoring cycle to examine issues under Indicator 12. MEEC staff reviews transition practices/timelines and children’s records, interviews district staff, and makes needed compliance findings and recommendations for improvement activities to improve school districts’ practice in this area. This helps to ensure that noncompliance is identified early, and timely correction is made.

- **MASSDE, in partnership with MEEC, MDPH, and Massachusetts Head Start** continues to develop an Interagency transition Agreement. The purpose of this agreement is to address the mandate to develop interagency agreements for collaboration and coordination.
Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA) is a professional development program created to meet the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach students with moderate disabilities or students who are English language learners by assisting teachers with waivers earn licensure. MLA course are delivered through the Massachusetts Online Network for Education (MassONE) and have at least one face-to-face session. This program increases the number of highly qualified teachers to work with young children transitioning into special education from Early Intervention programs.

Special Education Summer Institutes are statewide professional development opportunities provided free of charge to special education professionals. Sponsored by MASSDE in partnership with school districts, educational collaboratives, institutions of higher education, and professional associations, the Institutes are designed to support efforts by approved private special education schools, educational collaboratives, and local school districts to increase the quality of programs and services provided to students with disabilities, and increase the number of highly qualified educators working in the field of special education. Additionally, SEPP collaborates with the MASSDE Office of Curriculum and Instruction to provide professional development institutes in specific curriculum content areas such as Mathematics, Science, and Literacy. This program enhances the skills of teachers that work with young children transitioning into special education from Early Intervention programs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

The Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

### Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Indicator 13:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

**Measurement:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Student Records reviewed</th>
<th># of Student Records with 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; annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs; evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed; and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</th>
<th>Percentage of student records in compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>93.5% 99.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred in FFY2010 (2010-2011):

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage**

Massachusetts is committed to ensuring that appropriate transition planning occurs for every student. This year's rate of compliance of 93.5% is 3.5 percentage points lower than the new baseline rate of 97% established in FFY2009. Because MASSDE is not reporting 100% compliance of participating cohort districts with the FFY2010 data, MASSDE has reviewed and will work to improve both its data collection protocols and ongoing professional development and technical assistance for districts. MASSDE's analysis indicates that some slippage occurred because Special Education district staff in the reporting cohort districts were not sufficiently trained to use the revised Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist (see Appendix C), the state's Indicator 13 data collection tool. Improved training will be provided to districts participating in the FFY2011 data collection. In addition, MASSDE will consider revising the Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist to ensure greater ease of use while maintaining the checklist's utility as a robust data collection tool.

The change in MASSDE's reported compliance rate from its February 1, 2012 reported rate of 93.5% is due to intensive and targeted data verification and correction activities to ensure that the validity and reliability of the data. MASSDE made findings of noncompliance, based on the FFY2010 data submission, against two districts; results of correction activities for these districts will be reported in next year's APR. Because MASSDE is not reporting 100% compliance of participating cohort districts with the FFY2010 data, MASSDE has reviewed and will work to improve both its data collection protocols and ongoing professional development and technical assistance for districts. MASSDE will revise the Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist (see Appendix C) for FFY2011 data collection to ensure greater ease of use while maintaining the checklist's utility as a robust data collection tool.

In the February 1, 2012 APR, MASSDE reported a total sample of 1369 students. MASSDE has revised this number to 1360, reflecting one instance of district regionalization which has transferred a district into a different cohort on an alternate data collection schedule.

MASSDE's disaggregated data analysis for FFY2010 reveals many areas of significant strength statewide, as well as some areas needing improvement. For example, 98.8% of all students were reported to have received transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable them to meet their postsecondary goals, and 98.3% of all students were reported to have appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals based on age-appropriate transition assessment. At the district level, 95.1% of districts report that 100% of student records contain appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals that are updated annually. Also, 94.5% of districts report that 100% of student records display evidence that students were invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were to be discussed, and 94.5% of districts report that 100% of student records display 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.

**Improvement Activities**

Because MASSDE is dedicated to achieving 100% compliance with Indicator 13, MASSDE will continue to provide districts with high quality technical assistance and professional development that is both broad-based and targeted to areas of need brought to light through data collection and analysis. MASSDE anticipates strengthening collaboration with state agencies to improve coordination of services for students of transition age. In FFY2010, MASSDE engaged in several activities for maintaining high levels of compliance related to effective transition. MASSDE continued to focus its efforts on creating tools and resources to support educators’ efforts to engage in effective transition planning for students. Information on additional improvement activities is available below, and in Appendix A.
Verification of Correction of Noncompliance

In FFY2009, MASSDE reported a compliance rate of 97%. Six districts were found to be in noncompliance with the requirements of Indicator 13 were notified by letter on March 25, 2011. Therefore, corrective action must be completed by March 25, 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY 2009 (July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(corrected within one year from the date of notification to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA of the finding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of findings not verified as corrected within one</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year [(1) minus (2)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of findings not timely corrected (same as the number</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from (3) above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of findings the State has verified as corrected</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, districts were instructed to submit hard copy documentation to MASSDE as evidence that transition planning had been completed for each individual student affected by the noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. Districts were also required to sign a statement of assurance certifying that the identified student(s) had received appropriate transition planning and that the district had in place the appropriate policies, practices and procedures to ensure that all students entitled to transition planning services were receiving such services in a timely manner. In addition, districts were required to collect and electronically submit via secure portal subsequent, updated data demonstrating that districts have made changes and instituted new policies and practices that allow them to achieve 100% compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b).

If all conditions and criteria were met within one year of the March 25, 2011 finding of noncompliance, MASSDE will consider the noncompliance identified in FFY2009 as timely corrected. If all conditions and criteria are not met within that timeframe, MASSDE will issue a determination that the finding will remain open, and additional corrective action will be required. MASSDE will report on the status of these activities during the APR revision period in the spring of 2012.

MASSDE will report on the verification of correction of noncompliance activities for the FFY2010 data in the FFY2011 APR for Indicator 13.

Additional Improvement Activities

---

5 Please note that the Massachusetts Part B FFY2009 SPP/APR Response Table incorrectly refers to the State's FFY2009 reported baseline data as 95.4%. The reported baseline was actually 97%. See page 87 of the Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan, FFY2005-FFY 2012, available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/SPP2009.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/SPP2009.pdf).
Additional improvement activities that affected secondary transition in the areas of professional development for educators and technical assistance for school districts included:

- **Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA).** MASSDE’s State Personnel Development Grant offered several online graduate level courses in a variety of key areas, including Postsecondary Transition Planning. Specific course titles offered during FFY2010 were Generalist Transition Planning, Youth Development and Self-Determination, and Transition Topics. These courses were taught by faculty at the University of Massachusetts- Boston’s Institute for Community Inclusion. The Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN) provided two courses for educators, How to Partner with Families of Middle and High School Students with Disabilities to Achieve Success and Parent and Professional Partnerships: Transition Planning for Students with Disabilities in Middle and High School.

- **The Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Program for Students with Disabilities** grant program is focused on building partnerships between high schools and state public institutions of higher education to offer inclusive concurrent enrollment opportunities for students with severe disabilities. As part of the technical assistance provided to the 22 participating districts, school personnel learned how to conduct person-centered planning for students with disabilities. This transition planning approach is student-led and promotes greater self-determination and self-advocacy skills in youth with disabilities. Partnerships continue to develop their programs to include individualized community-based, competitive integrated employment opportunities that align with participating students’ career goals and course selection.

- **Secondary Transition – Transition Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work** is a five-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education awarded to the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC) that will help support youth with disabilities transitioning from school to work. As part of this initiative, vocational rehabilitation counselors are collaborating with school districts to support youth with disabilities in their transitions from school to work, postsecondary education, and independent living. In addition, MRC is currently engaged in developing a transition guide for families of students with disabilities.

- **Work-Based Learning Plans (WBLP) for Students with Disabilities.** Through work-based learning experiences, students have an opportunity to learn about various career paths, explore different work styles, and learn about the environmental supports that are available. Additionally, these experiences allow students to discover the type of work they enjoy, and how they learn best in a workplace setting. The WBLP assists district personnel and families to improve transition outcomes for students with disabilities. The WBLP contains a scoring rubric that serves as a student performance evaluation guide to facilitate employer assessment of each participating student’s WBLP Foundation Skills. Beginning in FFY2008, the MASSDE Special Education Planning and Policy Office (SEPP) began collaborating with the Student Support, Career and Education (SSCE) Service unit at MASSDE to develop a one page guidance document entitled **Using the Massachusetts Work-Based Learning Plan In Transition Planning Activities for Students with Disabilities** and to enhance the WBLP Scoring Rubric. The one page document is intended to encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities in WBLP programs; to be used as an option for individual student transition planning; and to support educators, employers, Connecting Activities’ field staff, Workforce Investment Boards, One Stop Career Centers, and Local School-to-Career Partnerships in implementing quality work-based learning for students with disabilities.

- **The Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Training Project** was developed to supplement ongoing personnel preparation activities provided within school districts and other agencies. Two topic areas relate directly to secondary transition planning: Transition from Adolescence into Adulthood in Massachusetts, and The Massachusetts Transition Planning Chart and Effective Transition Planning.
- MASSDE offered distance-learning opportunities from the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) through its Professional Development Series, at no cost to school districts and educational organizations in Massachusetts.

- MASSDE has a long standing Collaboration with Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN), which is the federally-funded Parent Training and Information Center that provides free information, support, technical assistance, and workshops to Massachusetts families who have children with disabilities. This year’s topics that relate to transition included Basic Rights in Special Education, Celebrate Yourself! Self-Determination and Successful Students, An IEP for My Child, Transition 101–High School to Adulthood, and a two-day transition conference, Planning a Life: Making the Most Out of High School.

- Educational Proficiency Plan (EPPs). The purpose of the EPP is to provide the support students need to stay in school to meet graduation standards and to have the requisite skills needed for postsecondary success.

- An Act Relative to Bullying In Schools. MASSDE provided best practice guidance to districts to assist them to incorporate social and emotional learning – a key factor in postsecondary success for students with disabilities – as part of the general curriculum of every school. Schools were required to have social and emotional learning curricula in place for the fall of school year 2011-2012.

- Central Massachusetts Communities of Care Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS) Grant Fund Code 250. The development of pro-social behaviors by students with disabilities of transition age was promoted through this Worcester County initiative to increase the capacity of school districts in Worcester County to foster positive school climates, to support positive behaviors throughout participating schools, and to reduce disruptive behaviors.

- Dropout Prevention and Recovery Workgroup–MASSDE Urban & Commissioner’s Districts Unit and Secondary Support Services Unit. This initiative focuses on facilitating the sharing of promising practices and provision of technical assistance and support to 77 Massachusetts urban districts with at least one school with a dropout rate that exceeded the state’s rate. Improved practices in these districts include better transition planning for students with disabilities.

- Dropout Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Website. This website, a valuable resource for stakeholders working with students with disabilities of transition age, describes information and resources including an extensive collection of dropout reduction related articles/reports, other websites, dropout data overview information, and descriptions of state activities.

- Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII). EWII is a predictive tool designed to identify students at risk for not graduating in four years or fewer of high school. EWII allows districts to develop and implement targeted, student-centered interventions to promote positive outcomes for students with disabilities of transition age.

- Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad). This U.S. Department of Education grant supports statewide and local efforts for high school dropout prevention, intervention, and recovery, targeting 133 targeted high schools with dropout rates higher than the state average. MASSDE provides technical assistance, training, and opportunities for schools to exchange promising practices.

- Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools. The Behavioral Health and Public Schools (BHPS) Framework and Assessment Tool provides guidance and assists schools to assess and set goals regarding activities and strategies to create supportive school environments that are integral to the success of students with disabilities of transition age.
Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA). MLA is a system of online education created to meet the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach students with moderate disabilities, enables Massachusetts educators to meet licensure requirements so as to address the needs of students with disabilities of transition age.

Massachusetts 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) – Enhanced Programs for Students with Disabilities. CCLC grants are designed to establish or expand community learning centers that operate during out-of-school hours and provide students with academic enrichment opportunities that complement the students’ regular school day. Some community learning centers have offered academic tutoring and job training for students with disabilities of transition age.

Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Grants. The purpose of the Tiered System of Support grants is to support the planning and designing and the development of demonstration sites of a tiered system of support. The MTSS outlines a single system of supports that is responsive to the academic and non-academic needs of all students, including students with disabilities of transition age.

The “Ten Step Guide for Comprehensive Educational Assessment of Students with Visual Impairments” includes a section describing the “hidden” characteristics of a vision loss that affect academic and social factors. Important to secondary transition planning, the document provides resources to help educators meet the unique needs of students with visual impairments and to prepare them for further education, employment, independent living, and community participation.

Community/Residential Education Project. The goal of this project is to facilitate effective transitions from school life to more independent life within the community for students receiving publicly-funded special education services who also meet the Massachusetts Department of Disability Services (MDDS) eligibility criteria for services. This will be accomplished by supporting less restrictive, more cost effective residential options, special education services, and community based supports.

District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs). MASSDE has opened six regionally-based DSACs to help identified districts and their schools access and use professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for all students. MFA courses (see above), including UDL Creating Positive Classroom Environments and Transition Planning, have been integrated into the menu of professional development options available to districts.

The following activities focused on improving effective transition and contributed to the state’s continued success in meeting its target for Indicator 13:

- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Saving and Creating Jobs and Reforming Education (ARRA) – IDEA
- Collaboration with Stakeholders
- Special Education Professional Development Summer Institutes

Additional information about these improvement activities is available in Appendix A.

MASSDE continues to report transition data publicly. This information, which is in the process of being updated for FFY2010, is available at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx.

MASSDE will continue to focus its efforts on improving the transition planning for students with IEPs, and looks forward to reporting on the results of these efforts in the FFY2011 APR.
Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

The Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives. Also, in the MA SPP, MASSDE has revised the Measurement heading in the FFY2009 baseline data table, and added additional explanation for identification and correction of noncompliance activities.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the ( # of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (Definition I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Target Data</td>
<td>48% 50.7% (434) (528)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the FFY2010 respondents, 48% (434) were enrolled in higher education (Definition I); 31.5% (285) were competitively employed (Definition II); 4.9% (44) participated in other postsecondary education or training programs (Definition III); and 4.3% (39) were in some other employment (Definition IV) within one year of leaving high school. This accounts for an overall engagement rate of 88.6% (802). See Chart 1.

Note: These calculations are hierarchical and represent an unduplicated count of respondents.

**Chart 1:**

![Chart showing percent of FFY 2010 respondents engaged by outcome category]

Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes Survey.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage**

FFY2010 is the second year in a four year cohort cycle in which the revised postsecondary outcomes survey of students with disabilities who exited high school the previous year, aligned with a revised
measurement and definitions, was conducted in Massachusetts. Students’ responses were recorded on the “Postsecondary Outcomes Survey” (Appendix D) or the Career/Vocational Technical Education (CVTE) “Graduate One-Year Follow-Up Survey.” Of the 3004 students with disabilities in the exiting cohort, MASSDE received survey responses from 904, or 30.1%. MASSDE continues to calculate representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, level of need, and program placement, and has determined the survey response to be generally representative of students exiting high school in school year 2009-2010. This determination is based on a comparison of the respondent data to exit data in the Student Information Management System (SIMS) database.

With a FFY2010 engagement rate of 88.6%, MASSDE met and exceeded the measurable and rigorous target of 82%. (See Graph 1 below for an overview of performance results for Indicator 14 during the SPP period, FFY2006 to date.) Information provided by the FFY2010 survey respondents indicates progress in all three postsecondary engagement measurements. Forty-eight percent reported that they were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (Measurement A), an increase of 5.6 percentage points over FFY2009 results, and 5.0 percentage points over the FFY2010 target. Under Measurement B, 79.4% of respondents reported that they were either enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school, an increase of 7.5 percentage points over FFY2009, and exceeding the annual target by 5.4 percentage points. The overall percentage of respondents engaged in post-graduate activities (Measurement C), 88.6%, is an increase of 7.3 percentage points over FFY2009 results, and exceeds the annual target by 6.6 percentage points. See Graph 2 for a comparison of FFY2009 and FFY2010 actual data.

Graph 1:
Massachusetts Part B Annual Performance Report (MA APR) for FFY2010
Submitted February 1, 2012; revised April 17, 2012

Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes Survey.

Graph 2:

Percent of Youth Who Had IEPs Who Are Engaged in Education, Training or Employment One Year After High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2006</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2007</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2008</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2009</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2010</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Respondents Who Are Engaged By Post-Secondary Measurement Area And Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Area</th>
<th>FFY 2009</th>
<th>FFY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is significantly more change in respondent enrollment in education compared to participation in employment since FFY2009. Additional information provided by the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) shows that 56.6% of all FFY2010 Massachusetts graduates with IEPs were enrolled in higher education within 16 months of graduation - an increase of 8.6% within only a slightly longer period. Also, 22.2% of survey respondents reported that they were looking for employment at the time of survey completion. Therefore, analysis suggests that the economy continues to affect exiters’ ability to find sustained competitive employment, and may be contributing to increased enrollment in postsecondary education.

Further analysis of respondent employment patterns shows that 73.6% of the total respondents reported having some level of employment within one year of exiting school. Interestingly, the definition of competitive employment is met by 56.1% of the total respondents; 24.6% meet the definition of both competitively employed and enrolled in higher education; and 5.9% meet the definition of both competitively employed and enrolled in other education or training. (MASSDE is pleased to report that 92.2% of the employed respondents had a job in the community at $8.00 per hour or higher.)

In response to a request from the statewide Special Education Steering Committee, MASSDE examined survey responses by disability category. This analysis showed that one year after exiting school, a significant proportion of respondents in each disability category completed at least one full term in a 4-year university or a 2-year college. Also, at 58.1%, enrollment in higher education and 13.0%, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, respondents with autism are much more likely to be attending school than working. More than half (50.8% of respondents with intellectual disabilities are either enrolled in higher education (20.0% or are competitively employed (30.8%)). Respondents in the communication, health, neurological and specific learning disability categories are engaged (Measurement C) at a level of 90% or higher. This level of analyses of postsecondary outcome data will be useful as MASSDE focuses on improvement activities and targeted initiatives to support college and career readiness and access for all students.

---

6 The Graduates Attending Institutions of Higher Education report provides information about the enrollment of Massachusetts high school graduates into institutions of higher education within 16 months of graduating high school. This information is provided either by district or school. In this case graduates were sorted by graduation year and special education status; data includes students who were ever reported in SIMS as part of this student group in high school. More information is available at: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/gradsattendingcollege.aspx.
The overall FFY2010 survey response rate is 30.1% which represents slippage of 14.7 percentage points over the previous year’s rate. In this cohort year, 2099 exiters did not respond to data collection outreach. While MASSDE considers the response to be valid and representative of the exiting students in the data collection cohort, MASSDE has analyzed contributing factors to the lower response rate. The FFY2010 response rate is attributable, in part, to the current unavailability of data from eight cohort districts (representing 671 students). Also, data was excluded from the FFY2010 calculation because the districts erroneously collected survey information from students who exited during school year 2010-2011. As of the date of this report, six districts are completing the FFY2010 data collection activity. MASSDE will have additional, updated actual target data to include in this report in the spring revision period. If data submission continues to be delayed, these districts will participate in a future cohort data collection cycle. Also, MASSDE posits that other factors related to the national and local economies, continued high rates of unemployment, and the housing crisis, have caused elevated rates of mobility, thereby affecting the ability of participating school districts to contact exiters.

This year MASSDE utilized a new school district data submission instrument designed to increase the validity and reliability of survey data submission. Unfortunately, technical issues limited the submission of district data to respondents only. For this reason it is not possible to ascertain the number of exiters that districts attempted to survey but were unable to contact because of outdated contact information.

MASSDE will address these issues for the FFY2011 data collection. Improvement activities will continue to focus on implementation measures that minimize the degree of variation introduced into the system.

Improvement Activities

In FFY2010 MASSDE engaged in activities that both directly and indirectly improve post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. Activities that support work in more than one indicator area are included in Appendix A.

- **MASSDE provides Data Collection Technical Assistance** to districts including guidance on the overall survey process and timelines, the selection of survey personnel and steps for contacting students. To support district data collection, optional tools are also provided such as student flyers, forms to collect student contact information, and scripts for survey interviewers. MASSDE also conducts an annual Survey Protocol Evaluation to determine usability for students and districts completing the data collection activity. This evaluation is intended to improve participation in the Indicator 14 survey process in addition to increasing overall data validity. Analyses of individual student responses and district response patterns as well as survey assessment by cohort districts inform MASSDE’s annual protocol evaluation.

- **Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA)** provides online, graduate level coursework to middle and high school educators across the state. Courses are also offered through the six regionally-based District and School Assistance Centers (DSAC) to districts and schools that are identified for targeted assistance. MFA includes four Transition focused course offerings: Generalist Transition Planning, Levels I and II; Youth Development and Self-Determination; and Parent and Professional Partnerships: Transition Planning for Students with Disabilities in Middle and High School. These courses have a significant effect on supporting improved post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. The courses help educators gain a better understanding of how disability affects student learning and provide educators with improved skills in the areas of curriculum design, instruction, and technology. These skills translate into improved student outcomes, higher graduation rates and increased postsecondary success.

- **Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA)** is a system of online education created to meet the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach students with moderate disabilities. MLA enables Massachusetts educators to meet licensure requirements so as to address the needs of students with disabilities, including those who are of transition age.

- **Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Grants** support the planning, designing and development of demonstration sites of a tiered system of support. The MTSS outlines a single
system of supports that is responsive to the academic and non-academic needs of all students, including students with disabilities of transition age.

- The **Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Training Project** was developed to supplement ongoing personnel preparation activities provided within school districts and other agencies. Two topic areas relate that directly postsecondary outcomes are Transition from Adolescence into Adulthood in Massachusetts, and The Massachusetts Transition Planning Chart and Effective Transition Planning.

- **The Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment (ICE) Partnership Program for Students with Disabilities** provides funding for partnerships between Massachusetts public high schools and public institutions of higher education to support enrollment of students with severe disabilities, ages 18 to 22, in postsecondary credit and non-credit classes with their non-disabled peers. Participants have not earned a Competency Determination and do not have typical high school prerequisites. During FFY2010, ICE technical assistance emphasized person-centered planning for students with disabilities. The current focus of technical assistance for the ICE partnership program is increased emphasis on program sustainability and community-based integrated employment opportunities for participating students that relate directly to course selection and career goals.

- MASSDE has a long standing **Collaboration with Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN),** the federally-funded Parent Training and Information Center that provides free information, support, technical assistance, and workshops to Massachusetts families who have children with disabilities. This year’s program topics that directly related to transition-aged students and postsecondary success included Celebrate Yourself! Self-Determination and Successful Students, Transition 101–High School to Adulthood, and a two-day transition conference, Planning a Life: Making the Most Out of High School.

MASSDE’s Special Education Planning and Policy (SEPP) office works with the following inter- and intra-agency offices to improve post-school outcomes for students with IEPs: Student Support, Career Readiness, and Adult Education unit (SSCA); the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC); and the Massachusetts Department of Developmental Services (MDDS). Some of the FFY 2010 activities include:

- **Massachusetts Bullying Prevention and Intervention Law, An Act Relative to Bullying in Schools** (SSCA), was enacted in May 2010. This comprehensive legislation requires schools and school districts to take specific measures to prevent bullying, and to address bullying and retaliation promptly and effectively if they occur. These requirements are intended to ensure that all students are able to access a free and appropriate education in a safe learning environment which, in turn, will support improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

- **The Dropout Prevention and Recovery Work Group**’s (SSCA) focus is to support district team action planning and to facilitate the sharing of promising practices in order to prevent student dropout thereby increasing the graduation rate.

- **The Dropout Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Website** (SSCA) includes an extensive collection of graduation and dropout prevention related news and trainings, articles/reports, and websites for students, parents, and educators.

- **Early Warning Indicator Index** (SSCA). EWII is a predictive tool designed to identify students at risk for not graduating in four years or fewer of high school. EWII allows districts to develop and implement targeted, student-centered interventions to promote positive outcomes for students with disabilities of transition age.

- **Educational Proficiency Plans (EPPs)** (SSCA) are required for students who have not achieved a Competency Determination (CD) through the grade 10 Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment
Massachusetts System (MCAS). The purpose of the EPP is to increase the support students need to stay in school, to meet graduation standards and achieve the requisite skills needed for postsecondary success.

- **Work-Based Learning Plans (WBLP) for Students with Disabilities** (SSCA). Through work-based learning experiences, students have an opportunity to learn about various career areas and try different work styles, find out what type of work they enjoy, find out how they learn best in a workplace setting, and find out what natural supports are available. By providing students with disabilities the opportunity to explore a variety of career areas and discover what type of work they enjoy in the context of their academic environment, the WBLP promotes students staying in school and supports the development of skills to reach individualized postsecondary goals. WBLPs have also been incorporated into the Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Project (ICE).

- **Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad)** (SSCA). This U.S. Dept of Education grant supports statewide and local efforts for high school dropout prevention, intervention, and recovery, targeting 133 targeted high schools with dropout rates higher than the state average. MASSDE provides technical assistance, training, and opportunities for schools to exchange promising practices.

- **Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools** (SSCA). The Behavioral Health and Public Schools (BHPS) Framework and Assessment Tool provides guidance and assists schools to assess and set goals regarding activities and strategies to create supportive school environments that are integral to the success of students with disabilities of transition age.

- **Massachusetts 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) – Enhanced Programs for Students with Disabilities** (SSCA). CCLC grants are designed to establish or expand community learning centers that operate during out-of-school hours and provide students with academic enrichment opportunities that complement the students' regular school day. Some community learning centers have offered academic tutoring and job training for students with disabilities of transition age.

- The goal of the **Community/Residential Education Project** (MDDS) is to facilitate effective transitions from school life to more independent life within the community for students receiving publicly funded special education services who also meet the Massachusetts Department of Disability Services (MDDS) eligibility criteria for services. This goal is accomplished by supporting less restrictive, more cost effective residential options, special education services, and community based supports.

- **Secondary Transition- Transition Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work** (MRC) is an interagency partnership developed to create and deliver innovative and non-traditional career development, job placement, and career advancement activities to over 750 transition age students with significant disabilities in the cities of Boston, Springfield, and Worcester. Helping students plan for the future is a major factor in maintaining their interest and purpose for staying in school. The Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC), in partnership with MASSDE, the Federation for Children with Special Needs, Urban Pride, the Massachusetts Workforce Development System, the Commonwealth Corporation, and the Institute for Community Inclusion (ICI), is addressing the unmet transition, career development, and employment needs of young adults with significant disabilities ages 16-26.

The following additional activities focus on improving post-school outcomes and contributed to the state’s continued success in meeting its target for Indicator 14:

- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Saving and Creating Jobs and Reforming Education (ARRA) - IDEA
- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) - IDEA
- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Title II-D Technology Competitive Grant Program: Online Courses and Modules Grant for At-Risk High School Students
- Closing the Achievement Gap Legislation
- Collaboration with Stakeholders
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Satellite Series
- Special Education Professional Development Summer Institutes

MASSDE has continued to report transition data publicly. Data for Indicator 14 are in the process of being updated at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

MASSDE will continue to focus its efforts on improving the effective transition for students with IEPs, and looks forward to reporting on the results of these efforts in the FFY2011 APR.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

The Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes a correction to the FFY2009 response rate, which was mistakenly reported as 4.68% instead of 48.6%. The MA SPP also includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

a. # of findings of noncompliance.
b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010-2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011, based on findings of noncompliance from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010):

a. MASSDE made 552,632 findings of special education noncompliance through the Problem Resolution System (PRS), Coordinated Program Reviews (CPRs), Mid-cycle Reviews (MCRs), State Performance Plan Compliance Indicators (SPPCI), or the Bureau of Special Education Appeals (dispute resolution system) (BSEA) between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010. See Appendix E, the Indicator 15 Worksheet for FFY2010, for the disaggregation of findings made from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.7

b. For the FFY2010 reporting period, ALL of the 552,632 findings of noncompliance identified were determined to be corrected within a year of the finding, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, when each district is:
   (1) correctly implementing regulatory requirements based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected, and
   (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district
   MASSDE notifies school districts in writing that noncompliance is deemed corrected.

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification: \[ \frac{552,632}{552,632} \times 100 = 100\% \]

---

7 In preparing the Indicator 15 Worksheet for FFY2010, MASSDE made changes to the designation of monitoring criteria in indicator/indicator clusters, originally developed for the baseline reporting year. Criteria that were not appropriately grouped, as well as monitoring criteria that have been since changed, have been reallocated to appropriate indicator/indicator clusters, or are reflected as "other areas of noncompliance."
Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):  

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

MASSDE has met the measurable and rigorous target of correction of 100% of findings of noncompliance within one year of identification in the FFY2010 reporting period. Of the 552 findings of special education noncompliance made through the PRS, CPR, or MCR systems; the SPPCI; or the BSEA in FFY2010 (findings made from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010), MASSDE verified that all of them were corrected within one year, an improvement over the FFY2009 compliance rate of 99.2%.

For each finding of noncompliance, MASSDE required the school district to submit to the appropriate MASSDE office (most often Program Quality Assurance (PQA)) additional documentation, including data, that provided evidence that the district took specific actions to correct the identified noncompliance. With regard to individual cases of noncompliance, the district was required to provide evidence showing that the appropriate corrections had been made for that individual student, unless he or she was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Districts were also required to review and revise their policies, practices, and procedures to ensure correct implementation of specific regulatory requirements where MASSDE identified that the root causes of noncompliance were related to improper implementation of the applicable regulatory requirements, and to submit updated data as necessary. These actions and evidence of correction were reviewed by MASSDE as part of a desk review process. MASSDE also conducted onsite verification visits as necessary to review individual student records and other documentary evidence of corrective actions taken. Through this process, MASSDE verified that each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the district’s jurisdiction, and that the district was implementing correctly all applicable regulatory requirements. There are no outstanding findings of noncompliance from this reporting period, nor from any prior reporting periods. (Please note that per OSEP’s instructions, detailed information regarding the correction of noncompliance related to other compliance indicators (e.g., Indicators 11, 12, and 13) is reported in the FFY2010 APR for those indicators.)

MASSDE’s progress with regard to identification and correction of noncompliance is attributable, in large part, to the extensive training and support provided to MASSDE staff about the one-year correction of noncompliance requirement. At the state agency level, improvements are also supported by updated administrative oversight of complaint management systems and timelines. Data tracking systems log the receipt of data and documents from districts, and track timelines for the timely review and written notification to districts of the outcomes of MASSDE’s determinations regarding districts’ progress toward the correction of noncompliance. Administrators review monthly electronic “report cards” that are issued to Monitoring Team supervisors and MASSDE staff in other program units; this system assists staff in managing and tracking unresolved issues of noncompliance. The tools have allowed MASSDE to engage in more timely interventions and to provide appropriate technical assistance and support to districts when it appears that progress toward correction of noncompliance is not sufficiently on track. The result of these efforts is demonstrated in the actual target data reported here. Intensive training for school district staff, described below, also supports the state’s compliance with the requirements of timely correction of noncompliance.

Improvement Activities

Consistent with MASSDE’s continued priority regarding timely correction of identified noncompliance, in FFY2010, MASSDE staff accessed technical assistance opportunities and consulted multiple resources about general supervision and timely correction of noncompliance. Among other things, PQA staff participated in teleconferences with other members of the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) Local Monitoring and General Supervision Work Group about general supervision, and the OSEP Mega Conference in Washington, D.C. in August 2011. Also, MASSDE staff participated in webinars throughout the year hosted by NERRC and OSEP on Memorandum 09-02, and consulted Massachusetts’ State Contact and NERRC state liaison on several occasions about verification of correction requirements.

MASSDE has used this information and updated guidance from OSEP to strengthen its processes and procedures for complaint management and timely correction of noncompliance. School districts play an
important role in ensuring that they maintain compliance with regulatory requirements during and after corrective action periods. As part of the CPR and MCR processes, school districts must report on the actions they take during corrective action periods to identify and respond to the root causes of identified noncompliance, and to sustain compliance with specific regulatory requirements. After implementing corrective actions, school districts must continue to monitor their compliance with the relevant requirement and to report results of this internal, local monitoring to PQA. This system has helped school districts become active partners in correcting noncompliance and sustaining compliance by allowing them to identify root causes of noncompliance and to target their efforts at correcting them. The success of these efforts is seen in the 0.8 percentage point increase in MASSDE’s Indicator 15 compliance this year, and the meeting of the compliance target.

Expanded implementation of the web-based monitoring system (WBMS) continued in FFY2010 to all school districts and charter schools scheduled for onsite visits in school year 2010-2011. School districts and charter schools participating in the third cycle of WBMS reviews submitted self-assessments in the spring of 2010. Upon completion of desk reviews by monitoring team chairpersons of those assessments, PQA began its onsite verification visits of participating school districts in October 2010. To provide subsequent monitoring cohort school districts with early notice of monitoring requirements and procedures, in the fall of 2011, MASSDE sponsored orientation sessions for 185 school and district personnel from 73 districts, and in December 2011 and January 2012, 245 personnel from 73 districts participated in WBMS computer lab based training. In the spring of 2011, MASSDE trained 10 personnel from 6 school districts in a web-based monitoring system pilot of the MCR. The MCR is a mid-point compliance review of special education, conducted in between a district’s CPR cycles; it is a requirement of state law. Participating school districts and charter schools must conduct an MCR self-assessment that consists of student record reviews and document reviews for the special education compliance monitoring criteria for which the district was cited as noncompliant in the previous CPR, and any new or changed monitoring criteria.

As the WBMS has been rolled out to all schools and districts in Massachusetts, and district and school personnel have gained experience in identifying and correcting noncompliance and preventing it from occurring, MASSDE has seen a significant reduction in identified noncompliance (1,018 findings reported in FFY2008, 638 in FFY2009 APR, and 552 reported this year), and an increase in the timely correction of noncompliance (85.5%, 99.2%, and 100%, respectively).

MASSDE provides support to districts through the web-based monitoring system (WBMS) corrective action plan and the electronic corrective action plan/progress reporting system (ECAP) to help them timely correct identified noncompliance. PQA trained school district staff that participated in the FFY2010 CPR monitoring cycle on ways to develop appropriate and responsive Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) through two planning and reporting tools. As part the training, district administrative personnel receive direct onsite technical assistance from monitoring team chairpersons, and program directors participate in subsequent in-depth training sessions. MASSDE anticipates more than 80 staff from 65 school districts will participate in these training sessions for the 2011-2012 monitoring cycle. These protocols and electronic reporting tools have increased MASSDE’s ability to collect and verify timely correction of noncompliance by increasing the efficiency of information-sharing.

MASSDE has incorporated what was learned from the technical assistance received from external sources, and feedback from districts and staff using the new monitoring system and tools, to further refine its monitoring system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance. These resources have assisted MASSDE in identifying and tracking districts’ noncompliance, and ensuring that it is corrected as soon as possible and no later than one year from identification by MASSDE. The effectiveness of these new and refined systems is seen in the improvement noted in this year’s target data of 100%.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources in the Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) remain appropriate.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints with reports issued [1.1]</th>
<th>Reports within 60-day timeline [1.1(b)]</th>
<th>Reports within timeline extended for exceptional circumstances or upon agreement [1.1(c)]</th>
<th>Percent of signed written complaints issued within appropriate timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE is submitting with this APR the *Table 7 Report: of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2010-2011*. Please see Appendix F.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage**

In FFY2010, the percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within timelines, or timelines appropriately extended due to exceptional circumstances, or because the parties agreed to extend the timeline to participate in alternative dispute resolution, was **99%**. The two complaints for which reports were not timely issued were the result of: 1) a complaint determination having been made five days beyond the 60 day date; and 2) a determination having been made after two extensions were granted, first at the request of the school district and then at the request of the parent, without adjustment of the original extension date. In the latter case, the final determination was issued 19 days beyond the originally agreed-upon extension date. While this is a slight decrease in the compliance rate reported last year and slightly below the target, it is not statistically significant slippage.

MASSDE has shown significant improvement with regard to compliance with the requirements of Indicator 16 since the beginning of the SPP period, as demonstrated in the graph below.
Improvement Activities

In order to prevent missed timelines as the result of multiple grants of extensions, MASSDE has internally clarified with its complaint management staff that in the event multiple extensions are requested in the same matter, as occurred in one of the cases noted above, MASSDE will respond to each request with an extension letter that includes the appropriate revised timeline. This additional oversight will help to ensure that timelines are tracked consistently in cases in which more than one extension is requested and granted. These procedures for multiple extensions have been incorporated into existing internal procedures that MASSDE staff follows any time an extension is granted at the request of one or both parties for documenting extensions in writing to the parties and notifying them of a set date upon which MASSDE’s determination is due.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources in the MA State Performance Plan (MA SPP) remain appropriate.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement: $\text{Percent} = \frac{[(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) \text{ divided by } 3.2]}{\times 100}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearings fully adjudicated [3.2]</th>
<th>Decisions within timeline (including expedited) [3.2(a)]</th>
<th>Decisions within extended timeline [3.2(b)]</th>
<th>Percent of hearings adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or timeline properly extended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE is submitting with this APR the Table 7 Report: of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2010-2011. Please see Appendix F.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

During the FFY2010 reporting period, of the 19 hearing decisions fully adjudicated by the Bureau of Special Education Appeals (BSEA), two were issued during the 45-day timeline and 16 were issued within a timeline that was properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party, or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. One hearing decision was not issued timely, resulting in a compliance rate of 94.7%.

Since the first State Performance Plan (SPP) reporting cycle in FFY2004, results for Indicator 17 have been at or just below target, as illustrated in Graph 1 below. Each instance of Massachusetts’ not meeting targets for Indicator 17 during the SPP period has been attributable to a missed deadline for a single decision, often by only a few days. In FFY2010, the single decision issued outside of timelines was late by four calendar days. Because the indicator’s measurement requires reporting of only those hearing requests received and concluded within the same federal fiscal year, the number of decisions reported annually is small. Failure to meet timelines for a single decision can significantly affect the state’s rate of compliance. In this case, a single decision affected the FFY2010 compliance rate by more than 5 percent. MASSDE’s failure to achieve 100% compliance for Indicator 18 is neither the result of egregious
noncompliance with federal timelines nor systemic deficiencies in BSEA’s administrative systems. The data reflects individual performance of hearing officers, which requires individual monitoring and corrective action to prevent recurrence.

As noted above, the actual data reported for FFY2010 includes only the hearing requests received and concluded within the same federal fiscal year, July 1, 2010 to June 20, 2011. The reported data does not include requests for hearings completed or received in that year that carried over from the prior year or extended into the next federal fiscal year, or substantive written rulings issued during the reporting period. A more comprehensive look at state data on hearings shows that during FFY2010, BSEA hearing officers conducted full hearings resulting in 35 written decisions. This includes hearing requests filed in the prior fiscal year that were carried over into FFY2010. In this time period, BSEA issued 51 substantive written rulings not reported here, some of which were dispositive. BSEA received 544 hearing requests, compared to 545 requests received during the prior year.

It is important to note that BSEA offers expedited status to a broader range of cases than is required by federal law. A party can request expedited status when he or she asserts that: (i) the health or safety of the student or others would be endangered by delay; or (ii) the special education services the student is currently receiving are sufficiently inadequate that harm to the student is likely; or (iii) the student is currently without an available educational program or the student’s program will be terminated or interrupted, as well as specific instances involving student discipline. See Rule II.C.1 at page 7 (http://www.doe.mass.edu/bsea/forms/hearing_rules.pdf). Also, BSEA criteria for timely issuance of expedited decisions are more stringent than what is required by federal law. Under federal law, an expedited hearing must be held within 20 school days of receipt of the request, and a decision must be issued within 10 school days after the hearing. BSEA hearing rules require that the hearing be held within 15 calendar days of the request, and that the decision be issued no more than 10 calendar days after the hearing. BSEA closely monitors these timelines to ensure compliance with these requirements.

Improvement Activities

The BSEA’s focused attention on managing internal procedures for assigning cases and tracking timelines is the reason Massachusetts continues to demonstrate high levels of compliance in meeting due process timelines. Central to its efforts are administrative systems for assigning cases that take into account hearing officers’ caseloads, and systems to manage timelines centrally. Also, supervisory staff
are engaged in multi-time per week “check-ins” with hearing officers regarding the status of cases and decisions with regard to timelines, and require weekly status reports from hearing officers. Cases are also reassigned as necessary to facilitate timeliness of decisions. Since these oversight systems were originally implemented, the BSEA has noted that hearing officers are more consistent and measured in their ability to manage statutory timelines.

As reported in the FFY2009 APR, in July 2010 the administrative oversight and management of the BSEA was transferred from MASSDE to the Massachusetts Division of Administrative Law Appeals (DALA). DALA and the BSEA director together manage the BSEA and its functions. Several changes to administrative systems are underway to support BSEA’s compliance efforts. In collaboration with the Chief Magistrate of DALA, BSEA is re-evaluating and revising hearing officer evaluation systems to include a specific focus on meeting timelines. Also, in FFY2011, BSEA is transitioning to a new database (“Time Matters”), which should allow for better tracking of cases and timelines. Additional information about this system will be reported in the FFY2011 APR.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources in the Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) remain appropriate.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>48% - 58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution meetings held [3.1]</th>
<th>Number of resolution session settlement agreements [3.1(a)]</th>
<th>Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution session resolved through resolution session agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE is submitting with this report Table 7 Report: of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2010-2011. See Appendix F.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010:

Explanation of Progress or Slippage

The Bureau of Special Education Appeals (BSEA) reports that of the 39 resolution meetings that were held in FFY2010 and reported to it, 24 were resolved through written resolution session settlement agreements. This is an agreement rate of 61.5%, which is an increase of 6.2 percentage points over the actual data reported for FFY2009. The agreement rate exceeds the measurable and rigorous target range for FFY2010.

Massachusetts' performance for Indicator 18 has significantly increased since FFY2007, as illustrated in Graph 1 below. Massachusetts now uses a range for its measurable and rigorous targets in order to reflect that annual rates of dispute resolution are variable and depend on many individualized factors; performance cannot be compared to a static target.
Graph 1:

The data reported here regarding resolution sessions that resulted in resolution agreements is only a fraction of the number of hearing requested received by BSEA during FFY2010. During this period, BSEA received 544 requests for hearing; 19 decisions were issued after hearing (see MA APR for Indicator 17). Of those, 140 were initiated by the school district, and therefore not included in the reported resolution session data. The vast majority of hearing requests filed were either resolved prior to hearing – through settlement conferences, mediated agreements, or informal dispute resolution – or subsequent to the commencement of the hearing through dispositive rulings, withdrawals, and other similar processes. While the number of reported resolution sessions is small, this additional data shows that BSEA has a robust and highly successful program of alternative dispute resolution, including, but not limited to, settlement conferences and advisory opinions.

**Improvement Activities**

The BSEA has improved its ability to report more accurate and reliable data regarding resolution session agreements through its use of a system of direct data reporting. Rather than requiring parties to submit written data at the end of the resolution period only – an administrative task that can be incomplete when parties engaged in dispute resolution are appropriately focused on substantive issues and fostering positive relationships rather than tracking data – Hearing Officers call parties directly to find out about the status of resolution meetings and any subsequent agreements that may have been reached.

This telephone contact is supplemented by written communication between the BSEA and the parties that includes a written reminder of the legal requirement to withdraw the request if the case is settled in a resolution session, and a form to be completed to withdraw the request. Frequent communications with parents and school district personnel has resulted in increased understanding of and compliance with the requirements to submit resolution session data to BSEA.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources in the Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) remain appropriate.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>75% - 86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Target Data for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediations held [2.1]</th>
<th>Mediation agreements related to due process complaints [2.1(a)(i)]</th>
<th>Mediation agreements not related to due process [2.1(b)(i)]</th>
<th>Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE is submitting with this APR the *Table 7 Report: of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2010-2011.* Please see Appendix F.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage**

The Massachusetts mediation program is managed by the Bureau of Special Education Appeals (BSEA) under the Massachusetts Division of Administrative Law Appeals (DALA). Of the 809 mediations held by the BSEA in FFY2010, agreements were reached in 706. Forty-six of those were related to due process complaints, and 660 were not. Overall, agreements were reached in 87.3% of mediations held in FFY2010. MASSDE exceeded its measurable and rigorous target.

For the last six years, MASSDE’s data has shown a slight increase each year in the percent of mediations held that resulted in agreements. These results are comparable to national mediation success rate data that are reflected in the measurable and rigorous targets that MASSDE has set for Indicator 19.

Graph 1 below shows the results over time, reaching a high in the current reporting year.
Of interest to the BSEA and MASSDE is the number of mediations overall that were held each year. Graph 2 below. While the number of mediations in FFY2010 is lower than those of all prior years except for the baseline year (FFY2005), the percent of agreements reached has increased, as noted in Graph 1 above.
Improvement Activities

Success of mediation may be measured not wholly by the number of mutually satisfying agreements reached, but also by the openness of the collaborative process and its ability to encourage mutual respect, promote communication, and support positive working relationships between parents and school districts. The BSEA makes information about mediation and alternative dispute resolution available to parents and districts to improve their understanding of the mediation process. Some information is made available through trainings and technical assistance about due process and alternative resolution sessions offered in partnership with the Federation for Children with Special Needs (Massachusetts’ Parent and Training Information Center) and other organizations. Other information is included on the BSEA’s website at http://www.doe.mass.edu/bsea/mediation.html. As a result of these efforts, Massachusetts is among the states with the highest usage of mediation annually.

The BSEA continuously reviews requirements under the IDEA and state special education law and regulations, and assesses current dispute resolution systems to determine whether administrative changes are needed to improve training for mediators and interested parties, data collection, processes and procedures, and available resources, and the state’s dispute resolution system generally. One specific project is related to assessing the effectiveness of facilitated IEP meetings, a process that the BSEA has been supporting for three years as an early intervention conflict resolution method. BSEA mediators serve as facilitators, but do not work in the same school districts they cover as mediators. The survey activity, which will be completed by the end of FFY2011, will be used to analyze whether the parties at the table were able to accomplish the goal(s) of the IEP meeting, e.g., to review documents, determine eligibility, determine services, etc. Anecdotally, the BSEA has noted the positive role that facilitators play in dispute resolution by mitigating some of the many distractions (including, but not limited to, anger, emotional outbursts, frustration at not being heard, rude behavior, and inattentiveness) that may keep parties from completing their tasks at IEP Team meetings. With respondents’ input, the BSEA will be able to examine more comprehensively the use of and outcomes from its supported dispute resolution systems.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):

Proposed targets, improvement activities, timelines, and resources in the Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) remain appropriate.
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and

b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

States are required to use the “Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric” for reporting data for this indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 (2010-2011)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):

State reported data are:

a. Submitted on or before due dates: **100%**

b. Accurate: **97.7%**

Indicator #20 Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. APR Grand Total</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 618 Grand Total</td>
<td>42.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. APR Grand Total + 618 Grand Total (B)</td>
<td>87.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N/A in APR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N/A in 618</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*)</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100)</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The target data for FFY2010 are based on MASSDE’s ability to produce its required data submissions for FFY2010 (618 data: Tables 1-8, and the APR submission) in a manner consistent with OSEP’s data submission requirements. The compliance rate is the percentage of data submissions that were deemed to be submitted successfully for FFY2010. For further explanation on how this calculation was derived, please refer to the scoring rubric, Appendix G.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

**Explanation of Progress or Slippage**

Using OSEP’s Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric, MASSDE has achieved a score of **97.7%** on its submission of required state data in FFY2010. This is a slightly lower than the FFY2009 rate of 97.8%.

In the APR data section of the scoring rubrics, MASSDE received a perfect score. Data submitted for all indicators were valid, reliable, and used correct calculations. MASSDE had one issue in the 618 section of the scoring rubric which prevented it from demonstrating full compliance with accurate submission. Although Table 4 (Exiting) data was submitted on time, MASSDE received an audit error due to an identified discrepancy between reported total and computed total. MASSDE corrected and resubmitted the data.

**Improvement Activities**

MASSDE continues to work on improving data collection systems by reviewing and revising as necessary its rigorous validation rules and definitions for reporting categories. Throughout the year, MASSDE staff provides technical support and training for school district data providers on data collection resources and procedures. MASSDE also accesses available resources and information made available by the Data Accountability Center (DAC), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and other organizations on data collection and reporting.

In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY2010, MASSDE has used the Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric, consistent with OSEP’s instructions and following consultation with the Massachusetts Statewide Special Education Steering Committee.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2010 (2010-2011):**

The Massachusetts Part B State Performance Plan (MA SPP) includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, or resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
APPENDIX A: Selected Cross-Cutting Improvement Activities (FFY2010)

### An Act Relative to Bullying In Schools

**Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 13, 14 – FFY2010**

This bullying prevention and intervention law, Chapter 92 of the Acts of 2010, was enacted on May 3, 2010 and required all Massachusetts districts and schools to develop and adopt bullying prevention plans by December 31, 2010. In response to this new requirement, MASSDE created the Model Bullying Prevention and Intervention Plan, which schools and districts were encouraged to use as they developed their own plans.

In addition to requiring these plans, the law included special provisions focused on students with disabilities that the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Team determined to be at risk for bullying on the basis of their disability. MASSDSE provided best practice guidance to school districts that highlighted the importance of the requirement to incorporate social and emotional learning as part of the general curriculum of every school, and the significant effect that these whole-school initiatives have in creating positive school climates and giving all students, including students with disabilities, the skills and abilities to prevent and respond to bullying behaviors. Schools were required to have social and emotional learning curricula in place for the fall of school year 2011-2012.

The Model Bullying Prevention and Intervention Plan and Guidelines for the Implementation of Social and Emotional Learning Curricula K-12, as well as other technical assistance documents, are available on MASSDE’s website at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/bullying/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/bullying/).

### ARRA Entitlement Grants

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2010**

In year two (2009-2010) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Massachusetts school districts allocated funds to a variety of activities designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Many of the districts’ initiatives were continuation activities from the first year of ARRA. Examples include:

- developing new and/or expanded programs designed for special populations such as students on the Autism Spectrum, dropout prevention and recovery, reading disabilities, transition to school and career, etc.;
- integrating a pilot program from the first year of ARRA into a sustainable district program;
- integrating technology purchased for students with IEPs with consultation and technical assistance to instruction across all settings and curricula, progress monitoring, and reporting data;
- analyzing the results of program/district needs assessments and developing activities to address identified priorities, including professional development for teachers, administrators, paraprofessional/assistant teachers, related service providers, and other personnel relevant to the education of students with disabilities and their families;
- creating and sustaining positive learning environments;
- collaborating with other districts to develop and implement new programs, especially for high school students, to provide transitional services including career and college preparation;
- hiring support staff including guidance counselors, school social workers, school adjustment counselors, etc., with particular therapeutic and counseling skills for this population; and
- other innovative initiatives specific to characteristics and needs of the districts.
## ARRA Title II-D Technology Competitive Grants Program – MASSDE Student Support Services Unit

**Indicators 1, 2, 4, 14 – FFY2008-2012**

The purpose of this initiative is to support projects to work collaboratively with MASSDE to create, implement, and evaluate online courses/modules for underserved high school students in alternative education, credit recovery, or credit acceleration programs.

- Fourteen grantees received funding under this grant, in two rounds. The grantees include a variety of educational settings: alternative programs and schools, vocational-technical high schools, comprehensive high schools, and education collaboratives.
- Grant recipients specifically targeted students that are most at-risk for not graduating.
- Courses/modules were developed to align with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and the Massachusetts High School Program of Studies (MassCore).
- All grant recipients were required to spend at least 25% of their funds on professional development. Grantee professional development strategies reflect a wide range of approaches in terms of the amount of training provided, topics covered, methodology, and provider expertise. To date, 280 teachers and other staff have participated in professional development activities. Approximately 15% of the staff had taught an online course before, and only 13% had developed an online course previously.
- Courses, modules, and other products are co-owned by MASSDE and will be in available for use by other districts – free-of-cost – at the end of the project period (October 2011). Expected final products created by grantees: 46 courses (e.g., algebra I, biology, and American literature), 63 modules (e.g., human anatomy, the Cold War, poetry, and renewable energy), and five other products (e.g., professional development courses and a guide for administrators).

## Central Massachusetts Communities of Care Positive Behavioral Interventions (PBIS) Grant (Fund Code 250)

**Indicators 2, 4, 5, 13 – FFY2007-2012**

The purpose of this grant program is to support the partnership of select school districts in Worcester County with the Central Massachusetts Communities of Care Project (CMCC) to develop and implement PBIS, a tiered system for improving school climate by supporting positive behaviors throughout the school. Schools participating in the grant program receive PBIS training, associated technical assistance, and other resources from the CMCC. CMCC is a provider of care management services for youth with serious emotional disturbance, with community-based family centers in Worcester County. The priorities of the grant program are to:

- Increase the capacity of school districts in Worcester County to foster positive school climates, support positive behaviors throughout participating schools, and to reduce disruptive behaviors; and
- Increase participating schools’ ability to identify students, grades 4-8, in need of mental health services, and to respond to the need for intensive support via both internal capacity and community-based mental health providers.

The goal of the school district-CMCC partnership is to identify at-risk students who are in need of mental health services and to reduce and/or prevent court involvement among students with emotional impairments. Participating districts receive professional development and onsite assistance in the development and implementation of the principles of PBIS. The training from this grant is designed to ensure sustainable implementation and long-term success of this initiative in participating schools.

## Closing the Achievement Gap Legislation

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14 – FFY2009-2012**

On January 18, 2010, Massachusetts enacted this education reform legislation to intervene in underperforming (Level 4) schools. The schools identified are targeted for aggressive intervention that is focused on a plan developed in collaboration with the superintendent, the school committee, the local
teachers’ union, administrators, teachers, community representatives, and parents.

### Closing the Early Literacy Gap for Students with Disabilities (Fund Code 297)

**Indicators 6, 7, 8, 12 – FFY2009-2012**

The purpose of this competitive grant opportunity is to support the development of strategic literacy action plans to enhance and align educational systems, curriculum, and instructional practices across public preschool and/or kindergarten programs, Head Start, and community-based early childhood education programs. The strategic action plans help to ensure that all programs serving students with disabilities, ages 3-5, are effective, engaging, developmentally appropriate, and designed to create seamless transitions across environments and into the next phase of the students’ education. District study teams assess current language and literacy strategies and practices, literacy intervention and differentiated strategies, and ways to use information from students’ IEPs to support language and literacy across the curriculum and in the school environment. The study teams design and implement community-based activities to support early literacy development.

### Collaboration Between MASSDE’s Curriculum and Instruction Math Office and Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP)

**Indicators 3, 5 – FFY2008-2012**

With input and guidance from the urban superintendents, the Massachusetts Urban Math Liaisons network (Mathematics directors providing guidance and support in Mathematics in Massachusetts public schools) identified the supporting students with disabilities in Mathematics as a critical priority in the urban districts. In response to this need, the Math Specialist Support group dedicated its meetings to developing a district level collaboration between special educators and math specialists. The second year of this collaborative group was devoted to:

- Understanding the characteristics of struggling math learners with disabilities;
- Using the IEP as an instructional tool;
- Making mathematics Instruction accessible in the classroom; and
- Establishing protocols for collaborative planning and collaborative teaching (general and special educators).

In addition, in the spring of 2011 this group was instrumental in piloting a Universal Design for Learning Mathematics course associated with Massachusetts FOCUS Academy in the spring 2011 to available to MFA applicants in September 2011.

### Collaboration with Federation for Children with Special Needs

**Indicators 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14 – FFY2005-2012**

MASSDE has a longstanding relationship with the Federation for Children with Special Needs (FCSN), the Parent Training and Information Center federally funded to provide free information, support, technical assistance, and workshops to Massachusetts’ families who have children with disabilities. FCSN provides training and technical assistance to families throughout Massachusetts on behalf of MASSDE. Training topics include:

- Parent’s Rights,
- IEPs
- Understanding My Child’s Learning Style
- The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)
- Turning 14 – embedding Transition Planning Form into training
- 504 Plans
- Discipline and Suspension
- Creating a Vision
- Celebrate Yourself
- Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
Massachusetts

FCSN is a key partner of MASSDE in writing and implementing the State Personnel Development Grants. Responsibilities of FCSN include the developing and providing instruction for 3-credit graduate level courses for Massachusetts educators on ways to work with parents. Additional responsibilities include the creating self-guided modules for parents and families on successful transition for middle and high school students, and developing alternate version of these modules for special populations such as Spanish speakers. Staff from FCSN facilitates collaboration between district staff and parents through the A.P.P.L.E. model. Also, FCSN participates in the state stakeholder input opportunities, assists in developing MASSDE technical assistance documents, and has included MASSDE staff as presenters in the annual *Vision of Community* conference.

MassPAC at the Federation for Children with Special Needs is the statewide organization providing information, training, and networking opportunities to Massachusetts special education parent advisory councils (PACs) and the professionals who collaborate with them. After almost eleven years as a private non-profit, MassPAC became part of the Federation in July 2009.

**Collaboration with Stakeholders**

*All Indicators – FFY2005-2012*

**Special Education Advisory Council (SAC)** – The SAC is a group of parents and professionals charged under federal and state special education laws to provide policy guidance to MASSDE on issues affecting special education and related services for students with disabilities within the Commonwealth. The SAC’s responsibilities include:

- advising MASSDE on unmet needs within the state in the education of students with disabilities;
- providing public comment on proposed rules and regulations for special education;
- advising MASSDE on developing evaluations and corrective action plans; and
- assisting in coordinating services to students with disabilities.

**Statewide Special Education Steering Committee** – Stakeholders from across disciplines, including parent, educators, administrators, advocates, and agency representatives, meet annually as members of the Steering Committee to:

- review baseline and current data (618 data and monitoring data);
- identify areas in need of attention; and
- plan for improvement activities.

**Community/Residential Education Project – Massachusetts Department of Developmental Services (MDDS)**

*Indicators 5, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2012*

The Community/Residential Education Project was developed through an interagency agreement between MASSDE and MDDS. The project’s goal is to facilitate effective transitions from school life to more independent life within the community of students receiving publicly funded special education services who also meet the MDDS eligibility criteria for services. This goal is accomplished by supporting less restrictive, more cost effective residential options, special education services, and community based supports.

The project provides greater flexibility in service delivery based on individual support needs. Supports are provided to participants and their families to increase the family’s capacity to care for their child in the home, and/or increase the participants’ and families’ capacity for effective interactions within the home and with the community. Students participating in this project may return home from residential education placements, or utilize the project to obtain a diverse array of supports in their home communities as an alternative to an initial residential special education school placement.

**Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Training Project**

*Indicators 3, 5, 11, 13, 14 – FFY2005-2012*

The CSPD Training Project was developed as a response to requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education (IDEA) 97 that required states to develop a multifaceted approach to personnel development under regulations for CSPD. To fulfill this obligation, MASSDE’s Special Education Planning and Policy
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The Development Office (SEPP) instituted a series of training activities to supplement ongoing personnel preparation activities that are provided within school districts and other agencies. The CSPD Training Project continues to provide training opportunities to districts through:

1. **Training Modules**: SEPP offers training units to assist school districts and other agencies in providing high-quality professional development on special education related topics. The units consist of annotated PowerPoint Presentations, and in some cases, supplemental handouts. Topics include:
   a. The Massachusetts IEP Process
   b. A Principal's Role and Special Education in Massachusetts
   c. Is Special Education the Right Service?
   d. Transition From Adolescence Into Adulthood in Massachusetts
   e. The Massachusetts Transition Planning Chart and Effective Transition Planning
   f. Specific Learning Disabilities: Eligibility Determination under IDEA 2004

2. **CSPD Trainers**: SEPP has contracted with a limited number of trainers who receive ongoing training on the CSPD Training Modules. CSPD Trainers work with groups of 50+ individuals in public schools, and approved special education schools. Requests for training for groups larger than 50 people serving multiple districts and/or agencies are given priority.

3. **CSPD Districts**: The 40 largest districts in Massachusetts may send the districts' professional development provider to training sessions on the modules. It is an opportunity for participants to affect MASSDE work (including the development of new modules) and network with colleagues.

---

**Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summit**

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 - FFY2008-2012*

MASSDE holds an annual Curriculum and Instruction Summit to:
- share MASSDE resources for strengthening curriculum, instruction, and assessment;
- identify needs for future development of curriculum resources and technical assistance; and
- build capacity of the MASSDE, districts, and schools through regional partnerships.

Topics at the Summit include:
- **Adventures in Text Analysis: Reading and Writing Elementary Science**
- **Following Fractions: Exploring a Common Core Math Learning Progression**
- **The Mystery of Sheltering Content**
- **Teaching Vocabulary to Support Content-Area Learning**
- **Beating the Odds with Low-Income High School Students – Research & Tools**
- **The Massachusetts System of Tiered Instruction – Overview**
- **Ready or Not Writing and Step Write Up: Online Writing Support Programs for College Readiness**
- **Preparing Students for the 21st Century with New Literacies**
- **College and Career Readiness For All: A Case Study of a Successful District-Wide Strategy**
- **Where the Rubber Meets the Road: Implementing the Common Core**
- **Mathematics Learning Communities - An ESE Resource for School-Based Professional Learning**
- **The Massachusetts System of Tiered Instruction – Implementation**
- **An Overview of the Massachusetts Common Core Standards Initiative: Focus on Mathematics**
- **An Overview of the Massachusetts Common Core Standards Initiative: Focus on English Language Arts and Literacy In History/Social Studies, Science, And Technical Subjects**
- **Common Core State Standards and Arts Education**
- **Library of Congress Resources for Common Core State Standards & History/Social Studies**
- **Massachusetts/WGBH Partnership – Massachusetts Teachers’ Domain**
- **The Achievement Gap: Recognizing Giftedness and Talent in All of our Students**
- **Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS): A Tiered System for Improving School Climate**
- **Creating Formative Assessments for Mathematics Using Released MCAS Items**
- **Literacy, Workplace Readiness, 21st Century Skills: Their Overlaps and Assessment**
- **Family Engagement: An Instructional Strategy that Works**
District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) – MASSDE Center for School & District Accountability

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13 – FFY2009-2012**

During FFY2009, MASSDE opened six regionally based DSACs to help identified districts and their schools use professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for all students. DSACs use a regional approach that leverages the knowledge, skills, and expertise of local educators to address shared needs through an emphasis on expanding district and school capacity for sustained improvement. Focused professional development offerings are directed at building essential knowledge and skills of educational leaders and teachers in major content areas and for key student groups.

During FFY2010, the professional development offerings for the DSAC districts included:

- Creating Positive Learning Environments,
- Universal Design for Learning,
- Pilot Universal Design for Learning/Mathematics
- Partnering with Families of Middle and High School Students with Disabilities to Achieve Success
- Youth Development and Self-Determination, and
- Transition Planning.

Dropout Prevention and Recovery Workgroup – MASSDE Urban & Commissioner’s Districts Unit and Secondary Support Services Unit

**Indicators 1, 2, 4, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2012**

The Workgroup is supported by both the Urban and Commissioner’s Districts unit and the Secondary Support Services unit of MASSDE. The Workgroup is made up of 18 urban districts whose combined number of student dropouts represents almost half of the total number of students in the Commonwealth who drop out of school. Last year, the group expanded its outreach to 77 urban districts that had at least one school with a dropout rate that exceeded the state’s rate. One hundred and thirty-three high schools met this criterion. The Workgroup’s focus is on facilitating the sharing of promising practices among districts, and supporting districts’ team activities through face-to-face meetings and webinars. Districts host the meetings, which usually include a short, formal presentation of the host districts’ initiatives and opportunities to observe the activities described, brainstorm ideas and resources, and provide support and technical assistance to each other.

Integral to the design of the proposal (and subsequent award) for the MassGrad award described below, is an expansion of the Workgroup to increase the number of participating schools and districts and broaden the variety and frequency of opportunities for networking and sharing promising approaches among the 133 schools in the high school graduation initiative cohort.

Dropout Prevention, Intervention, and Recovery Website – MASSDE Student Support and Secondary School Services Unit

**Indicators 1, 2, 4, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2012**

The website describes information and resources including an extensive collection of dropout reduction related articles/reports, other websites, dropout data overview information, and descriptions of state activities. New promising practices are added as they are developed and evaluated.

Early Childhood Special Education Professional Development

**Indicators 6, 7, 8, 12 – FFY2009-2012**

In FFY2010, MASSDE and the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (MEEC) co-sponsored two training series and a Special Education Professional Development Summer Institute for public preschool and kindergarten staff and other early childhood professionals working in programs that serve young students with disabilities. The series’ offered two training days focused on strengthening knowledge and skills of administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals. The first series addressed inclusion of young children with a diagnosis on the Autism Spectrum. The second focused on issues related to behavioral health...
and ways to address challenging behaviors in order to create meaningful inclusive opportunities for children with disabilities.

**Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII)**

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14 – FFY2009-2012*

Using a statistical regression model, in 2008 MASSDE developed the EWII as a predictive tool designed to identify students at risk for not graduating in four years or less of high school. Originally based on middle school data (grade 7 and 8), ninth graders from several urban districts were grouped according to five at-risk categories designated by degrees of risk:

- spring 2010 grade 8 MCAS Mathematics scores;
- spring 2010 grade 8 English language arts (ELA) scores;
- 2009-2010 attendance rate;
- number of 2009-2010 grade 8 in-school or out-of-school suspensions;
- age as of September 1, 2010.

The findings were then distributed to the appropriate districts to allow them to develop and implement targeted, student-centered interventions. This past year, the EWII was made available to all districts.

**Educational Proficiency Plans (EPPs) – MASSDE Student Support and Secondary School Services Unit**

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2012*

An EPP is an educational planning tool to be developed for the subject area(s) in which a student does not score at least 240 or above on the grade 10 English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). An EPP includes:

- a review of the student's strengths and weaknesses based on MCAS and other assessment results, coursework, grades, and teacher input;
- the courses the student will be required to take and successfully complete in grades 11 and 12 in the relevant content area(s); and
- a description of the assessments the school will administer to the student annually to determine whether s/he is making progress toward proficiency.

The EPP requirement is intended to increase the likelihood that students graduating from high school have the requisite skills needed for postsecondary success. Students are encouraged to and supported in taking challenging courses that will better prepare them for postsecondary educational or career opportunities. For students with disabilities, MASSDE recommends that students’ IEPs are used to assist in identifying students’ strengths and weaknesses in the learning environment as the EPP is developed.

**Emergent Literacy Grant**

*Indicators 3, 5, 6 – FFY2005-2006*

In order to increase districts' capacity to support all learners in emergent literacy, the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) provided training to educators and parents in the use of research-based, universally-designed technology for developing literacy skills in early learners, especially those with cognitive disabilities, in an inclusive environment. During the three years of the project (2004-2006), seventeen school districts that were involved in the Massachusetts Comprehensive System of Personnel Development participated in the "Universally-Designed Technology for Literacy" project. For more information, see [http://madoe.cast.org/](http://madoe.cast.org/).

**Federal School Turnaround Grants**

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 14 – FFY2008-2012*

These USED competitive grants are for states to use to assist the lowest performing schools. Districts with one or more Level 4 (underperforming) schools are eligible to apply. MASSDE awards grants based on the
plans districts develop under the Closing the Achievement Gap legislation. Districts applying for the grants are required to choose one of four prescribed intervention models and demonstrate capacity to implement that model effectively over three years. The four models or reform are:

1. Turnaround
2. Transformation
3. Close/Consolidate
4. Restart

To date, MASSDE has identified forty schools in ten districts as Level 4; and one district in Level 5 – receivership.

**Graduation and Dropout Prevention and Recovery Commission – MASSDE Student Support and Secondary School Services Unit**

*Indicators 1, 2, 14 – FFY2008-2010*

In August 2008, the Massachusetts State Legislature passed An Act to Improve Dropout Prevention and Reporting of Graduation Rates, which established a Commission to make recommendations in 10 topic areas. The Massachusetts Executive Office of Education (MEOE) released the final Commission report, Making the Connection, in October 2009. The report includes findings and recommendations in four main areas: 1) new statewide expectations; 2) early identification; 3) effective prevention, interventions, and recovery; and 4) responsive reforms and budget priorities.

**Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Programs for Students with Disabilities**

*Indicators 5, 13, 14 – FFY2005-2012*

This state-funded grant program is designed to build and expand partnerships between high schools in public school districts and state public institutions of higher education to offer inclusive concurrent enrollment opportunities for students with severe disabilities between the ages of 18 and 22, in credit and non-credit courses that include non-disabled students. These partnerships will result in improved systems that better serve students with severe disabilities and support their college and career success.

Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment programs are designed to promote and enhance students’ self-determination and self-advocacy skills; offer students opportunities to participate in the student life of the college community, as well as in career planning, vocational skill-building activities, and community-based competitive employment opportunities; and to improve students’ academic, social, functional, and other transition-related skills.

As part of the improvement and expansion of these programs, partnerships continue to develop their programs to include individualized, community-based, competitive employment opportunities that align with students’ career goals and course selection.

**Massachusetts 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) – Enhanced Programs for Students with Disabilities**

*Indicators 1, 2, 4, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2012*

Funded under Title IVB of the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), CCLC grants are designed to establish or expand community learning centers that operate during out-of-school hours and provide students with academic enrichment opportunities that complement the students’ regular school day. Over the past nine years, MASSDE has funded more than 180 sites in more than 50 communities across the Commonwealth. During the 2009-2010 school year, MASSDE developed the Pilot SPED Enhancement Grants to increase the capacity of existing CCLC sites to include students with more severe disabilities into an array of activities that advanced student achievement and provided opportunities for socializing and participating with peers without disabilities. Sites applying for these grants were required to include special education personnel with knowledge and skills to ensure safe access to the program’s activities, settings (indoor and outside) and the appropriateness of the activities for their particular students with disabilities. Awarded at the end of the reporting year, thirteen (13) sites offered pilot programs during the summer of 2010. Based on the success of...
these pilot programs, the SPED Enhancement Grants are being offered for the 2010-2011 school year and summer of 2012.

**Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA)**

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14 – FFY2007-2012*

MFA is a federally funded five-year grant (SPDG) that builds upon the previous successes of Project FOCUS and Project FOCUS Academy (PFA). The grant program provides online professional development opportunities and leadership institutes to educators, families, and other stakeholders on a variety of topics related to instructing students with disabilities, with a particular focus on middle and high schools. MFA courses offered this year include:

- Universal Design for Learning, Levels I and II
- Universal Design for Learning – Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners in Mathematics
- Creating Positive Learning Environments, Levels I and II
- Differentiated Instruction
- Implementing Collaborative Teaching
- Generalist Transition Planning, Levels I and II
- Youth Development and Self-Determination
- Partnering with Families of Middle and High School Students with Disabilities to Achieve Success
- Parent and Professional Partnerships: Transition Planning for Students with Disabilities in Middle and High School
- Topics in Transition

A new course, *Teacher-Leadership*, designed to prepare participants to assume leadership roles in their schools as demonstrated by their design, implementation, and evaluation of professional development activities that increase the capacity of the district in one of the focused content areas was offered this year. Candidates were invited to participate based on their completion of all of the courses offered in one of the content areas, and a recommendation from the course instructor(s). All MFA courses are research-based, have rigor and expectations of three or four credit graduate level courses, and target areas that increase educator effectiveness and student outcomes.

**Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad)**

*Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 – FFY2010-2012*

The U.S. Dept of Education awarded a High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad) grant to MASSDE. Only 29 projects were awarded out of 184 applicants and MASSDE was only one of two states to receive the grant. The purpose of the grant is to support statewide and local efforts for high school dropout prevention, intervention, and recovery. The focus is on the 133 high schools (MassGrad cohort) that exceeded the statewide annual dropout rate of 2.9% in the 2008-2009 school year. This award identifies 133 targeted high schools with dropout rates higher than the state average. MASSDE provides technical assistance, training, and opportunities for schools to exchange promising practices. The following are the key activities for this grant:

- **Creation of a state high school graduation coalition**: MASSDE will create an inter-agency, cross-sector coalition to facilitate statewide sharing of promising programs and practices.
- **Expansion of the Dropout Prevention and Recovery Workgroup**: MASSDE will considerably expand the existing Workgroup to increase the number of participating schools and districts and broaden the variety and frequency of opportunities for networking and sharing promising approaches among the 133 schools in the HSGI cohort.
- **Implementation of Research-based Practices in HSGI Cohort**: MASSDE will help support target schools in implementing a select menu of research and evidence-based practices and strategies through a competitive grant process, technical assistance, state guidance, and learning exchanges.
- **Establishment of Three New Gateway to College Sites**: MASSDE will create a new partnership with the Gateway to College National Network to establish the Gateway to College program – an early college model to support at-risk students.
The project has also established a Leadership Council that will support and inform the key activities as well as connect the project services with new and ongoing efforts across the state. A broad range of state agencies and community, statewide, and national organizations are represented on this council.

### Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA)

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14 – FFY2010-2012**

The Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA) was created to meet the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach students with moderate disabilities or students who are English language learners by assisting teachers with waivers earn licensure. MLA course are delivered through the Massachusetts Online Network for Education (MassONE) and have at least one face-to-face session. Begun in the spring of 2009, the MLA, when completed, will include nine, three-credit, graduate level courses that will provide:

- content to address the special education competencies required for the moderate special needs preliminary license (2 courses);
- content information included on the ESL/MTEL (4 courses);
- the knowledge and skills required for ELA and math instruction and covered in the Foundations of Reading and General Curriculum MTELs (2 courses);
- a course designed to create and maintain positive learning environments for all students (1 course).

Increasing the number of licensed educators teaching students with moderate disabilities grades PreK-12 and students who are English language learners is aligned with MASSDE’s goal of having qualified educators for every public school classroom and thereby improve student outcomes and reduce the achievement gaps.

### Massachusetts Task Force on Behavioral Health and Public Schools

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 – FFY2009-2010**

The Behavioral Health and Public Schools (BHPS) Framework and Assessment Tool was created by the BHPS Task Force and Department between 2009-2011. Both resources are designed to provide guidance as well as help schools assess and set goals regarding activities and strategies that staff and programs engage in to create supportive school environments. The Final BHPS Task Force Report, available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0811behavioralhealth.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0811behavioralhealth.pdf), outlines recommendations to state policy makers related to this work.

### Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Grants

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14 – FFY2010-2012**

Massachusetts has developed a blueprint outlining a single system of supports that is responsive to the academic and non-academic needs of all students. This blueprint, the Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS), provides a framework for school improvement that focuses on system level change across the classroom, school, and district to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are academically advanced. It guides both the provision of high-quality core educational experiences in a safe and supportive learning environment for all students and academic and/or non-academic targeted interventions/supports for students who experience difficulties and for students who have already demonstrated mastery of the concept and skills being taught. The purpose of the Tiered System of Support grants was to support the planning and designing and the development of demonstration sites of a tiered system of support.

### Massachusetts Online Resource Library

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14 – FFY2007-2008**

MASSDE/SEPP is developing an online Resource Library to highlight OSEP Funded Technical Assistance and Dissemination Resources and other online resources. This resource is designed to provide evidence-based practices in professional development. The library will include information on the IRIS Center; Access Center: Improving Outcomes for Students K-8; Center for Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS); National Center on Response to Intervention; and the NASDSE Professional Development Series.
Topics will include, but are not limited to:
- Co-Teaching Model
- Differentiated Instruction
- Transition Planning
- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
- Response to Intervention
- Accommodations
- Role of the Paraprofessional
- Supervising the Paraprofessional
- Disproportionality in Special Education

### National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Professional Development Series

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2012**

NASDSE, with support from the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN), offers the NASDSE Professional Development Series. These conferences bring nationally recognized experts to the states using technology, providing an affordable means of quality personnel development for a variety of stakeholders. Experts provide important information on high-interest topics to audiences that include state directors of special education, state agency staff, local administrators, teachers, related service providers, higher education faculty, families, and other stakeholders.

Conference topics that are made available via satellite, streaming video, and/or DVD, have included:
- Common Core Standards: What They Mean for States and Schools
- Using Technology to Support Teaching and Learning
- Special Education Teacher Evaluation: Issues and Answers
- Virtual Special Education: Issues and Answers

### Preschool to Grade 3 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Alignment Project (Fund Code 264A & 264B)

**Indicators 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12 – FFY2007-2012**

The purpose of this three-year grant program is to identify and support strategies and resources to increase districts' capacity to improve the quality of education and inclusion of children with disabilities by aligning and coordinating curriculum, instruction, and assessment from Preschool to Grade 3.

Planning grantees (264A) research, discuss and document their strategies, training, and progress within and/or across the age span, with a focus on how students with disabilities access the general curriculum. The teams bring together early childhood educators, elementary school staff, special education professionals, administrators, and parents to explore the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in inclusive classrooms; identify best practices to support all students along the pre-K to grade 3 continuum; and prioritize areas of strength and needed improvement.

Teams in the continuation year (264B) implement 2-3 strategies that have been identified during the planning year as a means of strengthening inclusion practices and building a continuum in the early elementary grades. FF 2010 will be the final year of funding for Fund Code 264B; best practices and outcomes will be reported and disseminated statewide. Forty-seven districts participated in the program.

### Procedures for Timely Verification of Correction of Noncompliance

**Indicators 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 – FFY2008-2012**

Using updated guidance from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and other technical assistance sources, MASSDE reviewed and revised procedures for verifying correction of noncompliance for the above-referenced indicators in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 from October 17, 2008. Verification activities include:
(1) if needed, changing, or requiring each district to change, policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance;
(2) for noncompliance concerning a child-specific requirement, requiring each district to submit updated data demonstrating that each district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance or completed the required action, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district; and
(3) requiring each district to submit updated data for review to demonstrate that each district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance).

When data reflects that each instance of child-specific noncompliance has been remedied, and that the district is 100% compliant with the specific regulatory requirements, MASSDE notifies the district in writing that it has verified correction of identified noncompliance.

Project FOCUS Academy

Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14 – FFY2005-2007

In the fall of 2004, MASSDE was awarded a three-year U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) funded State Improvement Grant (SIG) - Project FOCUS Academy (PFA). Project FOCUS Academy was designed to develop professional development programs to help students with disabilities build sound career goals and learn skills to ensure successful postsecondary outcomes. As part of the SIG, MASSDE worked with educators from selected high schools. The project’s design required study groups from high schools to participate in face-to-face and distance-learning professional development opportunities in the areas of:
- Transition/Postsecondary Outcomes;
- School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports;
- Universal Design for Learning; and
- Family Participation.

The distance-learning model was offered through MASSDE’s Massachusetts Online Network for Education (MassONE).

Revision of “Is Special Education the Right Service?” (ISERS)

Indicators 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 – FFY2008-2009

The ISERS document offers guidance for practitioners and parents on how to:
- identify students with disabilities;
- be knowledgeable of updated regulations and characteristics of disabilities;
- define appropriate services and interventions; and
- ensure a responsive general education environment for all students.

Revision began in March, 2009 with the convening of Disability Workgroups composed of experts in each of the areas of disability to review the current document for accuracy and relevance in light of new research and current practices.

Revision of “Ten Step Guide for Comprehensive Educational Assessment of Students with Visual Impairments”

Indicators 3, 5, 6, 11, 13 – FFY2008-2012

The “Ten Step Guide”: 1) recommends types of assessments that are useful in making a determination of eligibility for a student with a visual impairment for the initial eligibility determination or three-year reevaluation; 2) helps to ensure a common understanding of the purpose and complexity of conducting the specialized educational assessment of students with visual impairments; and 3) provides resources to help educators meet the unique needs of students with visual impairments, and to prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living.

Members of the Vision Impairment Disability Workgroup, working with other experts in the fields of diagnosis, treatment, education, and training of students with visual impairments, have collaborated to revise the “Ten Step Guide” to reflect updated regulatory information and include best practices. The revised guide includes a
new section describing the “hidden” characteristics of a vision loss that affect academic and social factors. Understanding these characteristics will enable non-vision specialists to facilitate meaningful inclusion and participation of students with visual impairments throughout the school day. The revised document has been re-formatted for use as a web-based resource and is about to be released.

Secondary School Reading Grant

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14 – FFY2005-2012*

The Massachusetts Middle and High School Reading Initiative project began in 2002 with the development of the Massachusetts Secondary Literacy Framework. This framework includes three key components: reading instruction for all students, additional intervention programs for struggling readers, and a comprehensive reading assessment system. The model's school-wide approach is based on eight fundamental principles: (1) involvement of all staff in literacy instruction; (2) a focus on reading across the content areas; (3) multiple interventions for struggling readers; (4) professional development for all staff; (5) adequate time for reading and writing in the school schedule; (6) flexible grouping patterns; (7) assessment that drives instruction; and (8) leadership support and guidance.

Recipient schools receive small planning grants to form reading leadership teams and to develop a school profile of current practices and a related school action plan. For three succeeding years, schools then receive small grants to implement one or more elements of their action plans. In addition to receiving a small grant, schools come together in network meetings three times a year to discuss current research on adolescent literacy and share their efforts to improve adolescent literacy achievement. Members of the Reading Leadership Team at each school (which consists of a cross-section of staff, including representatives from all content areas and special programs) attend these meetings.

Topics discussed include: Creating a School-wide Approach to Improving Reading; Assessing Literacy Needs; Vocabulary Development; Improving Comprehension; Motivation; Helping the Struggling Adolescent Reader; Content Area Literacy; and Effective Writing Instruction. Participants have had an opportunity to hear from a number of national literacy experts, including Cathy Collins Block, Dorothy Strickland, Tim Shanahan, Donald Deshler, Steve Graham, Donald Leu, and John Guthrie. Staff from project schools and other Massachusetts schools lead breakout sessions at each network meeting. These breakout sessions provide an opportunity for other project schools to learn about the promising practices that are being tried by other schools. At each meeting, school teams have a chance to meet with each other to reflect on the day’s learning and to discuss implications for their schools.

Secondary Transition – Transition *Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work – Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC) 5 Year Federal Grant*

*Indicators 1, 2, 4, 13, 14 – FY2008-2012*

Transition *Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work*, is a five-year grant from USED awarded to MRC to support transitioning youth with disabilities from school to work. The program focuses on aligning existing services and developing innovative practices. As part of this initiative, vocational rehabilitation counselors are partnering with local school districts to support youth with disabilities in their transitions from school to work, postsecondary education, and independent living. MASSDE, the Federation for Children with Special Needs, Urban Pride, Commonwealth Corporation, and the Institute for Community Inclusion are partnering with MRC to implement the grant activities.

Self-Assessment Disproportionality Tool for Districts

*Indicators 9, 10 – FFY2008-2009*

Incorporated into technical assistance for flagged districts with disproportionate representation in special education, this self-assessment tool encourages districts to examine their own policies and procedures regarding special education eligibility and disability definition.
Sign Language Web-Based Resource Library

**Indicators 3, 5 – FFY2008-2012**

Significant progress has been made on the Sign Language Video Resource Library. The purpose of this project is to develop STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) vocabulary reference tools that educational interpreters and teachers of students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing may incorporate into instruction. Available technical assistance will include written guides and a web based library, searchable by ASL and English. The design of the tool will be user-friendly, and promote ready access for end users. In addition, under this project, MASSDE provides a cost-free institute for educational interpreters to improve participants’ sign vocabulary in the STEM framework.

**SPecial EDition Online Newsletter**

**All Indicators – FFY2007-2008**

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide school districts with ongoing technical assistance and to prompt dialogue within, among, and between districts and MASSDE, organized around the State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators.

**Special Education Leadership Academies and Seminars**

**Indicators 3, 5, 6, 8, 11 – FFY2005-2012**

As part of the Special Education Summer Institute, MASSDE annually provides two Special Education Leadership Academies. The academies provide opportunities for school district special education administrators to develop new leadership skills and to improve current skills. Academy I is open to administrators who have one to five years of experience; Academy II is for administrators with more than five years of experience. Both Academies provide professional development to administrators in the following areas:

- effective leadership in the areas of state and federal laws and regulations;
- fiscal administration;
- data collection and analysis;
- staff recruitment and retention;
- instructional program design and improvement; and
- access to the general curriculum based on the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

MASSDE sponsors ongoing leadership seminars for former participants of the Leadership Academies for participants to reconnect and network with their Academy colleagues and share effective practices, policies, strategies, and products. In FFY2010 MASSDE designed, developed and implemented a team-based Special Education Leadership Academy for the District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) that included, in addition to the Special Education Administrator, school and district leaders such as Principals/Vice Principals, Curriculum Directors, and Guidance Directors. During the spring/summer of FFY2010, the MASSDE/Special Education Planning and Policy office collaborated with the MASSDE/Career/Vocational Technical Education unit to design and develop a Special Education Leadership Academy that followed the DSAC team-based leadership academy. This course is being implemented in FFY2011.

**Special Education Professional Development Summer Institutes**

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14 – FFY2005-2012**

The Special Education Summer Institutes are statewide professional development opportunities provided free of charge to special education professionals. Sponsored by MASSDE in partnership with school districts, educational collaboratives, institutions of higher education, and professional associations, the Institutes are designed to support approved private special education schools’, educational collaboratives’, and local school districts’ efforts to increase the quality of programs and services provided to students with disabilities, and increase the number of highly qualified educators working in the field of special education. Additionally SEPP collaborates with the MASSDE Office of Curriculum and Instruction to provide professional development.
institutes in specific curriculum content areas such as Mathematics, Science, and Literacy. Some of the Special Education Institutes topics include:

- Accessible Learning Through Technology
- Assessing English Language Learners (ELL) With Disabilities
- Collaborative Evaluation Led By Local Educators
- Current Issues in School-Based Occupational Therapy & Physical Therapy
- Improving Spoken and Written Language: From Research to Practice
- Literacy for Students who are Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing
- Making Assistive Technology Happen: Assistive Technology for Teaching and Learning
- Managing Behavior in an Inclusive Classroom
- Meeting the Academic and Non-Academic Needs of Students with Asperger Syndrome
- Strategies for Students with Sensory Processing Disorders in Inclusive School Settings
- Technology for Children with Visual Impairments and Multiple Disabilities.

**Special Education Program Improvement Grants (Fund Code 274)**

*Indicators 3, 4, 5, 11 – FFY2005-2007*

The purpose of this grant program was to fund professional development activities to improve the skills and capacity of educators to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities. Fund Code 274 was available to all public school districts and educational collaboratives (during FFY2005 – FFY2007). For FFY 2006 and FFY2007, the priorities for Fund Code 274 were:

- Priority 1 - Enhancing Induction and Mentoring Programs **(required)**
- Priority 2a - Serving Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders in Inclusive Settings
- Priority 2b - Curriculum Development, Instruction, and Classroom Assessment
- Priority 2c - Meeting the Behavioral and Social Needs of a Diverse Student Population
- Priority 3 - Recruitment and/or Additional Professional Development Needs as Identified by the District or Educational Collaborative **(10% max could be used for this priority)**

Almost every school district in the state utilized Fund Code 274 funds, and participated in regional professional development conferences designed to support the priorities of the grant. These grants were not issued in FFY2010, but will resume in FFY2011. Priorities for FFY2011 will be: Educator Effectiveness, Content Knowledge, Non-Academic Supports, and Secondary Transition.

**Special Education Program Improvement Grants (Fund Code 249)**

*Indicators 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 – FFY2005-2012*

The purpose of this grant program is to fund professional development activities that will help to improve the skills and capacity of educators to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities. Its priorities are to enhance program-based induction, mentoring, and retention programs and to advance the skills of educators through professional development activities. Fund Code 249 is available to all approved private special education schools.

Priorities for FFY2006 and FFY2007 were: Induction/Mentoring; and Curriculum Development, Instruction, and Classroom Assessment. FFY2008 and FFY2009 priorities were: Educator Quality and Effectiveness: Induction, Mentoring, and Retention; Supporting Schools and Students: Curriculum Development, Instructional Practices, and Classroom Assessment; and College and Career Readiness: Secondary Transition Planning.

These grants were not issued in FFY2010, but will resume in FFY2011. Priorities for FFY2011 will be: Educator Effectiveness, Content Knowledge, Non-Academic Supports, and Secondary Transition. All funded programs must be effective, sustained, and intensive in order to have a positive and lasting positive influence on classroom instruction and outcomes for students with disabilities.
### Special Education Website

**All Indicators – FFY2005-2012**

The Special Education section of MASSDE’s website provides a variety of tools, news items, and resources to districts, parents, and other stakeholders: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/). Some of the most visited sections of the website are:

- Headlines: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/)
- Contact Us – Opportunity for external customers to request information/ask questions: specialeducation@doe.mass.edu
- Grants: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/grants.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/grants.html)
- Training: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/training.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/training.html)
- Forms and Notices: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/)
- Special Education Program Plan: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/programplan/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/programplan/)
- Special Education Data: [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx)
- Massachusetts Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS): [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mtss.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mtss.html) and [http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/default.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/default.html)

### Trauma Sensitive Schools Initiative – MASSDE Student Support Services Unit

**Indicators 1, 2, 4 – FFY2008-2012**

This MASSDE initiative focuses on the needs of students who have experienced or witnessed trauma by assisting with reducing the barriers that may affect academic performance, classroom behavior, and relationships that result from trauma. MASSDE is working to bring "trauma sensitive" practices to schools across the state through annual trainings and technical assistance that incorporate best practices and strategies for creating a safe supportive school environment where all students can learn, and where students are held to high expectations.

### Work-Based Learning Plans (WBLP) for Students with Disabilities – MASSDE Student Support, Career & Education Services

**Indicators 1, 2, 4, 13, 14 – FFY2008-2012**

The [Massachusetts WBLP](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mtss/default.html) is a diagnostic, goal-setting and assessment tool designed within the school-to-career system to drive student learning and productivity on the job. It was developed by the MASSDE through an interagency collaboration of employers, educators, and workforce development professionals. Through work-based learning experiences, students have an opportunity to learn about various career areas and try different work styles, find out what type of work they enjoy, find out how they learn best in a workplace setting, and find out what natural supports are available. Students learn and practice basic foundation skills and begin to develop life-long career skills.

Beginning in March 2009, SEPP collaborated with the MASSDE [Connecting Activities](http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/default.html) Office to develop a guidance document called [Using the Massachusetts Work-Based Learning Plan In Transition Planning Activities for Students with Disabilities](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx) and to enhance the [WBLP Scoring Rubric](http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/default.html). The document is intended to: encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities in WBLP programs; be used as an option for individual student transition planning; and support educators, employers, Connecting Activities field staff, Workforce Investment Boards, One Stop Career Centers, and Local School-to-Career Partnerships in the implementation of quality work-based learning for students with disabilities. Through this collaboration, MASSDE also created the [Work Experience and Transition Activities resource webpage](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx). This resource lists resources, including websites, articles, and program materials, to assist in planning the work experiences and developing WBLPs for students with disabilities.
APPENDIX B: Massachusetts Parent Involvement Survey (FFY2010)

Parent Involvement Survey

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this important survey for parents of students receiving general education services and for parents of students receiving special education services.

Your answers to this survey will help put your experiences and voice at the center of school, district and state efforts to improve services and results for children and families in your school and your district. Your opinions matter!

No one in your school, the district or state will be able to view your answers to the survey questions. Reports on the results will not include any information that would identify you or your child. Your answers are completely confidential.

(NOTE: If you have more than one child currently enrolled in school, you may submit one or more surveys, based upon your experiences as related to your children.)

Asterisk (*) indicates an answer is needed. Thank-you!

Child’s School District *

Please select one from drop down list

Child’s School Name *
### Child's Race/Ethnicity (Select one) *

- White
- Black or African-American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Multi-racial (2 or more races)

### Language Spoken in Home (Select one) *

- English
- Spanish
- Portuguese
- Chinese
- Creole/Haitian
- Vietnamese
- Other

### Child's Gender *

- Male
- Female

### Child's Grade Level (Select one) *

Select Child's Grade
For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices:

very strongly disagree (VSD)
strongly disagree (SD)
disagree (D)
agree (A)
strongly agree (SA)
very strongly agree (VSA)

You may skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Teachers and other school personnel encourage me to participate in the decision-making process. |
|Teachers give me enough time and opportunities to discuss my child's needs and progress. |
|Teachers are available to speak with me. |
|I am invited to participate in school-sponsored activities. |
|I was given information about the behavior and discipline policies of my child's school. |
|I am treated as an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program. |
|School personnel return my phone calls and emails in a timely manner. |
|The school has a person on staff that is available to answer parents' questions. |
|The school offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers. |
|Teachers and other school personnel interact with me in a professional manner. |
|Teachers and other school personnel invite me to share my knowledge and experience about my child with school personnel. |
|Teachers and other school personnel seek out parent input. |
|Teachers and other school personnel respect my cultural heritage. |
|Teachers treat me as a team member. |
|Teachers show that they expect my child to succeed. |
|The school gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education (e.g., understanding the curriculum being taught). |
|My child's school connects families to other families that can provide information and mutual support. |

Does your child receive an Individualized Education Program (IEP)? *

○ Yes  ○ No
Asterisk (*) indicates an answer is needed. Thank-you!

EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ELEMENTARY

Child’s Primary Disability (as indicated on child’s IEP) (select ONLY one) *

- Autism
- Communication Impairment
- Deaf-Blind Impairment
- Developmental Delay (Ages 3-9 only)
- Emotional Impairment
- Health Impairment
- Hearing Impairment
- Intellectual Impairment
- Multiple Disabilities
- Neurological Impairment
- Physical Impairment
- Specific Learning Disability
- Vision Impairment
- Don’t know

PLACEMENT

For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices that best describes your child’s special education placement: YES or NO. You may skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Description</th>
<th>Response Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Inclusion (IEP services are provided outside the general education classroom less than 21% of the time--80% inclusion.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Inclusion (IEP services are provided outside the general education classroom at least 21% of the time, but no more than 60% of the time.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially Separate Classroom (outside general education classroom more than 60% of the time.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Day School (all IEP services should be provided outside the general education classroom and in a public or private separate school that only serves students with disabilities.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP Services Other (IEP services for 3 to 5 year olds only) that do not meet one of the choices above, e.g. related services only, in home.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices:

very strongly disagree (VSD)
strongly disagree (SD)
disagree (D)
agree (A)
strongly agree (SA)
very strongly agree (VSA)
not applicable (NA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child had a positive experience during his/her preparation to transition from grade to grade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child received enough information about the new school/next grade to prepare him/her for the transition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IEP Team discussed my child’s transition needs at my child’s last IEP Team meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was provided with enough information so that I could support my child during and after the transition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child’s school offers parents training about special education issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child’s school invites parents to attend training sessions relating to the needs of children with disabilities and their families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The district had supports in place to assist me and my child as my child moved from an IFSP to an IEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child transitioned from early intervention to special education smoothly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit
Asterisk (*) indicates an answer is needed. Thank you!

MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL

Child’s Primary Disability (as indicated on child’s IEP) (select ONLY one) *

- Autism
- Communication Impairment
- Deaf-Blind Impairment
- Developmental Delay (Ages 3-9 only)
- Emotional Impairment
- Health Impairment
- Hearing Impairment
- Intellectual Impairment
- Multiple Disabilities
- Neurological Impairment
- Physical Impairment
- Specific Learning Disability
- Vision Impairment
- Don’t know

PLACEMENT

For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices that best describes your child’s special education placement: YES or NO. You may skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Choice</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Inclusion (IEP services are provided outside the general education classroom less than 21% of the time--80% inclusion.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Inclusion (IEP services are provided outside the general education classroom at least 21% of the time, but no more than 60% of the time.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially Separate Classroom (outside general education classroom more than 60% of the time.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Day School (all IEP services should be provided outside the general education classroom and in a public or private separate school that only serves students with disabilities.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP Services Other (IEP services for 3 to 5 year olds only) that do not meet one of the choices above, e.g. related services only, in home.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices:

very strongly disagree (VSD)
strongly disagree (SD)
disagree (D)
agree (A)
strongly agree (SA)
very strongly agree (VSA)
not applicable (NA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child had a positive experience during his/her preparation to transition from grade to grade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child received enough information about the new school/next grade to prepare him/her for the transition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was provided with enough information so that I could support my child during and after the transition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The district staff worked to help my child feel confident enough to attend part or all of his/her IEP Team meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school staff encourages student involvement in transition planning for high school. (for students 14 and older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child's graduation options were discussed before placement or curriculum decisions were made. (for students 14 and older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In preparation for my child's transition planning meeting, I was given information about options my child will have after high school. (for students 14 and older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child's school offers parents training about special education issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child's school invites parents to attend training sessions relating to the needs of children with disabilities and their families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school staff provides information on community resources that can assist my child in the transition from school to adult life. (for students 14 and older)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VSD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>VSA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The services that are provided are designed to help my child become self-sufficient after high school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX C: Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name _______________________________</th>
<th>SASID _______________________________</th>
<th>Age ________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District _________________________________</td>
<td>LEA Code ____________________________</td>
<td>Date ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Disability ______________________________________________________  Level of Need __________________**

## Transition Planning Form (28M/9)

- [ ] Is there evidence that the student has a completed Transition Planning Form (28M/9)?
  - [ ] Date Form Last Completed ____________________________

## Postsecondary Requirements in the IEP and/or TPF

[34 CFR 300.320(b) and (c)] [20 U.S.C. 1414 (d)(1)(A)(i)(VIII)]

- [ ] Beginning at age 14, does the student’s IEP and/or Transition Planning Form include:
  - [ ] Appropriate measurable postsecondary vision/goal(s) that are based on an age-appropriate transition assessment?
    - **Evidence such as:** IEP 1 - Key Evaluation Results Summary, Assessment Info, TPF pg 1 assessment info as described
  - [ ] Appropriate measurable postsecondary vision/goal(s) that are updated annually?
    - **Evidence such as:** Dated IEP 1 - Vision Statement, TPF, Assessment Info
  - [ ] Transition services*, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals?
    - **Evidence such as:** Transition Planning Form, page 2; Transcript, IEP 5 - Service Delivery Grid, IEP 8 – Additional Information
  - [ ] Measurable annual skill-based IEP goals related to the student’s transition services* needs?
    - **Evidence such as:** IEP 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and/or 8

## IEP Team Meeting Student Invitation

[34 CFR 300.321(b)] [20 U.S.C. 1414(d)(1)(B)]

- [ ] Is there evidence that:
  - [ ] The student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services* are to be discussed?
    - **Evidence such as:** N-3A
  - [ ] If appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the agreement of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority?
    - **Evidence such as:** N-3A

## Notes

### Type Name    Role

Authorized Signature (not required unless a hard copy is requested by ESE)
APPENDIX D: Postsecondary Outcomes Survey (FFY2010)

Massachusetts after High School Survey
(Student Survey)

Student Name: _____

**Working?**

☐ Yes ☐ No 1. At any time since leaving high school have you had a job?
   *(If you answered "NO" to this question, skip to question 6.)*

2. What kind of job did you have?
   - ☐ In a company, business, or service *(without a job coach)*
   - ☐ In the military
   - ☐ In supported employment *(with a job coach)*
   - ☐ Self-employed *(e.g., baby-sitting, dog grooming, lawn care, etc.)*
   - ☐ In your family’s business *(e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering, etc.)*
   - ☐ In sheltered employment *(where most workers have disabilities)*
   - ☐ Other *(Fill out the box below if this is selected.)*

☐ Yes ☐ No 3. If you count all the days you have had a job would it equal 90 days? *(About 3 months)*

☐ Yes ☐ No 4. Did you work about 20 hours per week or more?

☐ Yes ☐ No 5. Did you earn $8.00 per hour or more? *(Include tips)*

☐ Yes ☐ No 6. Are you looking for a job?

**Training or Education?**

☐ Yes ☐ No 7. Since leaving high school, have you been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one complete term in a:
   - ☐ Community college *(2 year program)*
   - ☐ College/university *(4 year program)*
   *(If you answered "YES" to this question, skip questions 8 and 9 and submit your form.)*

☐ Yes ☐ No 8. Did you attend education or training in another setting?

9. What kind of program did you go to?
   - ☐ GED
   - ☐ Adult Education
   - ☐ Continuing Education
   - ☐ Rehabilitation Services
   - ☐ Job Training *(Apprenticeship, Career Development, One-Stop Career Centers, City Year, Service Learning – AmeriCorps, Job Corp, Peace Corp, etc.)*
   - ☐ Other *(Fill out the box below if this is selected.)*
### APPENDIX E: Indicator 15 Worksheet (FFY2010)

#### PART B INDICATOR 15 WORKSHEET

In completing the worksheet, the number recorded in column (b) cannot exceed the number recorded in column (a). If the number in column (b) exceeds column (a) the column (b) cell will turn red.

This worksheet calculates the percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification. The self-calculating cells are highlighted in gray. Be careful not to enter data into these cells because the calculations will not work properly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</th>
<th>General Supervision System Components</th>
<th># of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)</th>
<th>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (7/1/09 to 6/30/10)</th>
<th>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 - educational placements.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.</td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service needs.

| Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Other areas of noncompliance: Faculty, Staff and Administration

| Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Other areas of noncompliance: Discipline

| Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 19 | 31 | 31 |
| Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings | 3 | 3 | 3 |

Other areas of noncompliance: Among Bureau of Special Education Appeals findings, appropriateness of IEP or of placement; among complaint findings, multiple areas, the bulk of which (65)

<p>| Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other | 42 | 107 | 107 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noncompliance Area</th>
<th>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</th>
<th>Column a</th>
<th>Column b</th>
<th>Column c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved non-implementation or partial implementation of IEP: Among monitoring findings IEP implementation and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of noncompliance: Parent/guardian communications</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>552</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>552 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification</strong></td>
<td>(b) / (a) X 100</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: To add more rows for Other areas of noncompliance, highlight row 32, right click and choose Insert.*

*Repeat - there are now two new rows. Highlight rows 26 and 27. Copy these rows.*

*Highlight rows 28 and 29. Paste. Following these steps will allow the calculation to work correctly.*
### APPENDIX F: Table 7 – Report of Dispute Resolution (FFY2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION A: Written, Signed Complaints</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Total number of written, signed complaints filed</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.1) Complaints with reports issued</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Reports with findings of noncompliance</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Reports within timeline</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2) Complaints pending</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION B: Mediation Requests</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.1) Mediations held</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Mediations held related to due process complaints</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2) Mediations pending</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION C: Due Process Complaints</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) Total number of due process complaints filed</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.1) Resolution meetings</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Decisions within extended timeline</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.3) Due process complaints pending</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing)</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)**

| (4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed | 8 |
| (4.1) Resolution meetings | 0 |
| (a) Written settlement agreements | 0 |
| (4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated | 0 |
| (a) Change of placement ordered | 0 |
| (4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending | 2 |
| (4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed | 6 |
## Appendix G: Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric (FFY2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APR Indicator</th>
<th>Valid and Reliable</th>
<th>Correct Calculation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** 40

### APR Score Calculation

**Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2009 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.

**Grand Total** - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = 45.00
# 618 Data - Indicator 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Timely</th>
<th>Complete Data</th>
<th>Passed Edit Check</th>
<th>Responded to Data Note Requests</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1 - Child Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 2/2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2 - Personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 11/2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3 - Ed. Environments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 2/2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4 - Exiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 11/2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5 - Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 11/2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6 - State Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 12/15/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7 - Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 11/2/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8 - MOE/CEIS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 5/1/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 618 Score Calculation

\[
\text{Grand Total} = \text{Subtotal} \times 2.045 = 42.95
\]
### Indicator #20 Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. APR Grand Total</th>
<th>45.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. 618 Grand Total</td>
<td>42.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =</td>
<td>87.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N/A in APR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N/A in 618</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =</td>
<td>97.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>