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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) for FFY2011 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 FFY2011, 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 13-6, submitted to States on December 15, 2012.

The MA APR contains actual target data from the FFY2011 reporting period, or FFY2010 consistent with instructions for a data lag for certain indicators, other responsive APR information for all SPP Indicators. The APR also contains information responsive to the areas identified in the Massachusetts Part B FFY2010 SPP/APR Letter and Response Table. Although Indicators 16 (complaint timelines) and 17 (hearing timelines) have been removed from the APR, MASSDE has reported this data here for consistency with prior APRs.

As noted in prior years’ submissions, MASSDE works collaboratively with stakeholders, including the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee, the Statewide Advisory Council, advocacy groups and parent organizations, and other state and local agencies, on efforts to support children with disabilities, their families, and their educators in order to improve student outcomes. These efforts, and the data included here, are made 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/. School districts’ data for specific Indicators are publicly reported at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx. The website is in the process of being updated to include information from the FFY2011 MA APR.

For the clarification report, MASSDE’s changes include updated links, revised information about data and activities, and revised measurements and reported data, in the reports for Indicators 3 (p. 14), 4 (pp. 20-21), 6 (p. 27), 9 (pp. 40-41), 10 (pp. 43-44), 13 (pp. 52-53), and 14 (pp. 54-57) at the request of OSEP or the review by MASSDE; and corrections to an error in the ordering of appendices (pp. 88 and 90). MASSDE has also included with this report a revised Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric that includes updated information to the original calculation completed by OSEP (pp. 96-98). Throughout this report, revisions to report language are marked by a strikethrough (deletions) or underline (additions).

Please contact me at 781.338.3388 or mmmittnacht@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
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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</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (2010-2011 data)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2010-2011 data and target, based on instructions for a data lag):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students with IEPs in 2010-2011 cohort</th>
<th>Number of Students with IEPs in cohort who graduated in four years or less</th>
<th>2010-2011 Four Year Graduation Rate for Students with IEPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,521</td>
<td>9,521</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE’s reported data, measurement, and target are aligned with the expectations and measurements of graduation for all students as described by MASSDE under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). MASSDE based targets for this indicator on a “closing the gap” progression that will eventually bring all students with disabilities to the same level as students without disabilities.

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, 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).

Statewide graduation data are reported at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/reports/gradrates/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/reports/gradrates/) and district level information about Indicator 1 is available at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

As required by instructions from OSEP, MASSDE has examined data for the year before the reporting year (i.e., data from 2010-2011), and compared the results to the target for the data period. For this reporting year, **65.6%** of students with IEPs in the cohort school year graduated from high school in four years or less. The Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted the targets of 95% 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 and publicly reports this rate because it is an additional measure of the year-to-year progress for all students, including students with IEPs. The five-year graduation rate for students with IEPs in 2010-2011 is 68.6%. Although this is a 0.7 percentage point decrease over the rate reported in the FFY2010 APR, it is a three percentage point increase over the four-year graduation rate for the current reporting period. MASSDE will continue to calculate and publicly report the five-year rate for subsequent cohorts as an additional measure of the year-to-year progress for students with and without IEPs.

Increasing the number of students graduating in five years is also a stated goal of MASSDE’s overall Delivery Plan. The five-year rate is included in the Plan as the target measure to increase support and programmatic opportunities for student success throughout high school, particularly for those students for whom it may take a longer period of time to graduate including students with disabilities.

As noted in Figure 1 below, the four-year graduation rate of students with IEPs has fluctuated between a low of 61.1% graduation rate in 2005-2006 to a high of 64.9% in 2008-2009. This year’s rate of 65.6% shows an increase of 1.5 percentage points over last year’s reported graduation rate, which is the highest single year increase in three years. This rate is also slightly higher than the 1.4 percentage point increase in the graduation rate for general education students during the same reporting period.

**Figure 1:**

![Four Year Graduation Rate of Students with IEPs: 2005-2006 to 2009-2010](image)

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

**Improvement Activities**

Consistent with instructions from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

For this report, MASSDE would like to highlight one ongoing improvement activity that is part of the College and Career Readiness work of the agency and the Commonwealth and is focused on improving graduation rates for students. The Massachusetts Work-Based Learning Plan (WBLP) is a diagnostic, goal-setting and assessment tool designed to drive learning and increase success in the workplace. The Plan identifies Foundation Skills as well as Career and Workplace Specific Skills all students should possess to be successful at work whether in a paid position, internship, job shadowing experience or supported work environment. This is an online tool that empowers students to keep track of their individual progress as they improve their social skills, academic skills, and job readiness skills. The work is aligned also with the priorities of successful secondary transition planning for students with disabilities.
as evidenced by the student-driven goal setting, work interest identification, skills development, and recognition of accommodations and supports necessary for success in the chosen field. Training is available for special education staff and five educational collaboratives have adopted the tool.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 1 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</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010-2011 data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2010-2011 data and target, based on instructions for a data lag):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students with IEPs enrolled in 2010-2011 (Grades 9-12)</th>
<th>Number of Dropouts with IEPs in 2010-2011 (Grades 9-12)</th>
<th>2010-2011 Dropout Rate for Students with IEPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45,059</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 that date 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 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).

As required by instructions from OSEP, MASSDE has examined data for the year before the reporting year (i.e., data from 2010-2011), and compared the results to the target for the data period. For this reporting year, 4.6% of students with IEPs dropped out of school in the cohort school year.


---

1 As described in OSEP Memorandum 13-6, for Indicator 2, States could choose to report using the same data source and measurement that the State used for the FFY2010 APR submitted on February 2, 2012, or use the data source and measurement included in the Part B Measurement Table that expires July 31, 2015 (i.e., “report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator”). MASSDE has elected to use the same data source and measurement that it used in previous reporting years. The calculation methodology is described in the MA SPP for Indicator 2.
Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

For the fourth consecutive year, data show a decrease in the dropout rate for students with IEPs. In school year 2010-2011, the dropout rate for students with IEPs was 4.6%, lower than the measurable and rigorous target and last year’s reporting rate of 4.7%. Figure 2 below illustrates the annual change in dropout rates of student with IEPs, and compares actual data to targets for the MA SPP period.

Figure 2:

![Annual Dropout Rate for Students with IEPs](image)

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

Of significant note is the four year pattern of increasing numbers of students with IEPs coupled with a declining dropout rate, as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Total number of students with IEPs</th>
<th>Total number of students with IEPs who dropped out</th>
<th>Annual Dropout Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>44,448</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>44,693</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>44,874</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>45,059</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MASSDE credits this improvement trend, in part, to targeted statewide dropout prevention initiatives to which the agency remains committed. Continued focus on implementing these activities and initiatives will help to maintain the decline in dropout rates and increase high school graduation rates for students with IEPs.
Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

For this report, MASSDE would like to highlight one ongoing improvement activity that is part of the College and Career Readiness work of the agency and the Commonwealth. This project, the Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad), is focused on reducing dropout rates for students with IEPs, the. In the fall of 2010 MASSDE was awarded the federally funded High School Graduation Initiative. A full description of this initiative can be found in Appendix A of this report. Based on a dropout rate of 2.9% for all students in school year 2008-2009, MASSDE identified 133 high schools with dropout rates higher than that state average that were then targeted for support and technical assistance (MassGrad cohort).

Two components of this award are targeted dropout prevention or recovery activities that may improve dropout rates for students with IEPs. 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.

In the MassGrad Gateway to College Programs, MASSSDE provides funding and technical assistance to three local school districts partnered with a local community college to offer dropouts an opportunity to earn their high school diploma while attending the community college and earning college credit. The program combines high academic expectations with one-to-one advising and intensive wrap-around supports that keep the students on track and successful.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 2 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 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 meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified\(^2\) and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. (choose either A.1 or A.2)(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.1 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.

A.2 AMO percent = \[
\frac{\text{(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AMO targets for the disability subgroup)}}{\text{(total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)}}\] times 100.

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

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

\(^2\) Massachusetts does not have modified academic achievement standards for students with disabilities.

\(^3\) Consistent with the waiver of certain requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act granted to Massachusetts by the U.S. Department of Education in FFY2011, Massachusetts no longer reports Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Rather, Massachusetts reports district and school progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps using a new 100-point Progress and Performance Index (PPI). MASSDE has elected to use A.2 for calculating the number of districts meeting state accountability targets for the disability subgroup.
### Measurable and Rigorous Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2011 (2011-2012)</th>
<th>A.2: Districts Meeting Accountability Targets for Disability Subgroup</th>
<th>B: Participation Rate for Students with IEPs</th>
<th>C: Proficiency Rate (CPI) for Students with IEPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative PPI</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>MATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Data</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

**Indicator 3A.2: Districts Meeting Accountability Targets**

Under the flexibility waiver granted to Massachusetts by the U.S. Department of Education in February 2012, Massachusetts is exempt from certain provisions of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. Among other changes, Massachusetts now uses an alternative accountability measurement known as the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) to calculate whether school districts are meeting accountability targets. Key changes to the State’s accountability system as a result of the waiver are:

- Massachusetts’ goal of reducing proficiency gaps by half by the end of the 2016-2017 school year has replaced the NCLB requirement of 100 percent of students reaching proficiency by the 2013-2014 school year. The 100-point Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which all students in a district, school, or subgroup are progressing toward proficiency, will gauge school districts’ progress toward this goal.

- Massachusetts now reports school and district progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps using a new 100-point Progress and Performance Index (PPI), rather than reporting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). For a school to be considered to be making progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps and thereby meeting accountability targets, the cumulative PPI for all students and high needs students must be 75 or higher.

- Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs); Science, and graduation and dropout rates (for high schools) are now incorporated into accountability determinations.

- Massachusetts has reduced the minimum group size for accountability determinations from 40 to 30 students. In addition, Massachusetts will base the progress of districts and schools on all students and “high needs” students – an unduplicated count of students belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English language learners (ELL) and Former ELL students, or low income students (students eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).


For Indicator 3A.2, MASSDE uses a cumulative PPI to report the percent of school districts meeting the accountability targets for the disability subgroup. A district’s, school’s or subgroup’s cumulative PPI is the average of its annual PPIs over the most recent four year period, weighting recent years the most (1-2-3-4). A cumulative PPI, reported on a 100-point scale, is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). For a school to be considered to be making progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps, the cumulative PPI for all students and high needs students must be 75 or higher. A sample calculation of PPI is included in Table 2 below.
Table 2: SAMPLE PPI Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing proficiency gaps (CPI)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (SGP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing proficiency gaps (CPI)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (SGP)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowing proficiency gaps (CPI)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra credit for decreasing % Warning/Failing (10% or more)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra credit for increasing % Advanced (10% or more)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual dropout rate</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort graduation rate</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points awarded for achievement, growth, and high school indicators</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points awarded for extra credit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total points awarded</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of achievement, growth, and high school indicators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual PPI</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative PPI (2009<em>1 + 2010</em>2 + 2011<em>3 + 2012</em>4 / 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the cumulative PPI, of the 307 school districts with a disability subgroup in FFY2011, 71, or 23%, met their accountability targets for the disability subgroup. This is the first year that MASSDE is reporting these results based on the ESEA waiver. The Indicator 3A.2 target for FFY2012, included in the FFY2011 SPP, was set in consultation with the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. MASSDE looks forward to improving the percent of districts meeting their accountability targets for the disability subgroup in FFY 2012.

**Indicator 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs**

In FFY2011, of the 93,483 students with IEPs enrolled in all grades assessed for English language arts (ELA), 72,712 participated in the regular assessment with accommodations and 10,310 participated without accommodation; 56 participated in an alternate assessment against grade level standards; and 8,679 participated in alternate assessments against alternate standards. In Mathematics, of the 93,509 students with IEPs enrolled in all grades assessed, 72,500 participated in the regular assessment with accommodations and 10,465 participated without accommodation; 67 participated in an alternate assessment against grade level standards; and 8,844 participated in alternate assessments against alternate academic achievement standards.

The total participation rate for ELA was **98.3%**. This is a decrease of 0.1 percentage points from the FFY2010 participation rate, and was slightly below this year’s target of 99%. Similarly, the participation rate for Mathematics – **98.4%** – was slightly below the target of 99% in FFY2011. This is a decrease of 0.2 percentage points over the participation rate reported in FFY2010. MASSDE considers these minor decreases to be “within the ballpark” of the target.

Table 3 below includes the actual data used to calculate the FFY2011 participation rate for students with IEPs in the MCAS ELA and Mathematics assessments. Table 4 shows the calculation of participation rates.
### Table 3: FFY2011 Participation Count of Students with IEPs on Statewide Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY2011 (2011-2012)</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 # of Students with IEPs Enrolled in Assessed Grades</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>40,287</td>
<td>40,975</td>
<td>12,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>40,288</td>
<td>41,001</td>
<td>12,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b # of Students with IEPs Assessed</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>39,965</td>
<td>40,341</td>
<td>11,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>39,998</td>
<td>40,393</td>
<td>11,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c # of Students with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d # of Students with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>30,710</td>
<td>32,502</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>30,917</td>
<td>32,154</td>
<td>9,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e # of Students with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f # of Students with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate academic achievement standards</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4,069</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS).

*Note: The difference in the number of students with IEPs in grades assessed in Mathematics (93,509) and ELA (93,483) may have included cases in which students were repeating a grade who previously took MCAS, students who were removed from the calculation on appeal, and students transferred in or out of the district during the testing period and therefore not completing testing in FFY2011.

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/2012statesum.docx](http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/alt/2012statesum.docx) includes additional information regarding the number of students with IEPs in alternate assessments based on grade-level and alternate academic 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 2012 results page, and is available through a web link in the “Related Links” box at:

Table 4: Calculation of MCAS Participation Rates - Percent = [(c + d + e + f) divided by (a) X 100].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(c) &amp; (d)</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>(e) &amp; (f)</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>÷</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>10,310 + 72,712</td>
<td>56 + 8,679</td>
<td>91,922*</td>
<td>93,483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>10,465 + 72,500</td>
<td>67 + 8,844</td>
<td>92,048*</td>
<td>93,509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NOTE: First-year ELL students with disabilities are not included in performance level or CPI results. However, first-year ELL students with disabilities who took the MEPA test are counted as ELA participants; in addition, first-year ELL students with disabilities who are present for Mathematics/Science and Technology/Engineering are counted as and Technology/Engineering participants. More information is available in the principal’s administration manual (PAM), the most recent version of which is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/testadmin/manual/PAM.pdf#search=%22PAM%22n. In FFY2011, 165 first-year ELL students with disabilities took the MEPA and 172 first-year ELL students were present for Mathematics/Science and Technology/Engineering.

MASSDE continues to report a very high participation rate for students with IEPs; this high rate represents nearly full participation. Figure 3 below illustrates the high level of participation rates of students with disabilities in statewide assessments from FFY2005 to FFY2011. At no time during the SPP period has participation been less than 97.6%.

Figure 3:

Source: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and Massachusetts Student Information Management System (SIMS).
**Indicator 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate academic achievement standards**

As stated above, based on MASDE’s ESEA waiver, the NCLB goal of 100 percent of students reaching proficiency by the 2013-2014 school year has been replaced with the goal of reducing proficiency gaps by half by the end of the 2016-2017 school year. The 100-point Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which all students in a district, school, or subgroup are progressing toward proficiency, will gauge progress toward this goal. For additional details on the CPI, please see the School Leaders’ Guide to the 2012 Accountability Reports, at: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/apy/2012/SchoolLeadersGuide.docx](http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/apy/2012/SchoolLeadersGuide.docx).

In FFY2011, the target CPI based on reducing the proficiency gap by half by the end of the 2016-2017 school year for the students with disabilities subgroup was 70.9 in ELA, and 64.2 in Mathematics. Actual FFY2011 data show that the CPI for students with disabilities – 67.3 in ELA and 56.9 in Mathematics – fell short of these targets. MASSDE will continue to work to improve results for students with disabilities in this area in FFY2012.

Longitudinal data illustrating improvement in increasing the CPI for students with disabilities since the beginning of the SPP reporting period is included in Figures 4 and 5 below.

**Figure 4:**

![Graph showing MCAS Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs: English Language Arts from FFY 2005 to FFY 2011.](source: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and Massachusetts Student Information Management System (SIMS).)
Table 5 is populated with the actual data used to calculate the FFY2011 proficiency rate for children with IEPs and the proficiency rate calculations.

### Table 5: Proficiency Rate for Students with IEPs in Statewide Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY2011 (2011-2012)</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># of Students with IEPs Scoring Proficient or Above in Regular Assessment with Accommodations</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>6,056</td>
<td>10,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6,185</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td># of Students with IEPs Scoring Proficient or Above in Regular Assessment without Accommodations</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2,231</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and Massachusetts Student Information Management System (SIMS).
## Grades 3-5

### ELA
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards: 0
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: 0

### Math
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards: 0
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: 0

### Total # of Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,301</td>
<td>8,416</td>
<td>16,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Grades 6-8

### ELA
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards: 0
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: 0

### Math
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards: 0
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: 0

### Total # of Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,982</td>
<td>6,393</td>
<td>19,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Grades 9-12

### ELA
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards: 0
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: 0

### Math
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Grade Level Standards: 0
- Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above in Alternate Assessment against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: 0

### Total # of Students with IEPs scoring proficient or above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,927</td>
<td>4,752</td>
<td>11,679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

For additional information, see Tables 26–42 for statewide achievement level results disaggregated by student subgroup for the spring 2012 MCAS tests at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/2012/results/summary.docx](http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/2012/results/summary.docx). Performance results of students with disabilities on regular assessments, alternate assessments based on grade-level standards, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, compared with the achievement of all students, are available at: [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/staterc/mcas.aspx?fyCode=2012](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/staterc/mcas.aspx?fyCode=2012).

### Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

In addition to these improvement activities, MASSDE maintained web-based resources for professionals including [MCAS-Alt Newsletters, resource guides, and educators’ manuals](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/staterc/mcas.aspx), and updated the document entitled [Requirements for the Participation of Students with Disabilities in MCAS](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/staterc/mcas.aspx). 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 FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

The MA SPP for Indicator 3 includes new baseline data for FFY2011 and targets for FFY2012 based on provisions of state’s waiver. Targets have been set with input from the Massachusetts Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The MA SPP also 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (2010-2011 data)</td>
<td>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 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2010-2011 data per instructions for a one year data lag):

**Indicator 4A: 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Districts</th>
<th>2010-2011 State Suspension/Expulsion Rate</th>
<th>Number of districts with suspension/expulsion rate of five times State Rate</th>
<th>% of districts with significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 districts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three hundred fifty school districts were included in this calculation; 43 with fewer than 30 students receiving special education services were excluded. Seven districts were identified as having a suspension and expulsion rate of five times the state rate in the FFY2011 reporting period. Of these, four did so for two consecutive years, and therefore were identified as having a significant discrepancy in their rate of suspensions and expulsion. The reported rate for significant discrepancy in the FFY2011 reporting period is **1.1%**.

**Indicator 4B: 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>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Districts 2010-2011</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</th>
<th>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</th>
<th>% of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten districts were excluded from the calculation because the districts did not meet the State’s minimum “n” size of 10 for one or more racial/ethnic group; 383 school districts were included in the calculation. Five districts were identified as having significant discrepancies by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs. Of these, only one had policies, procedures or practices that were deemed to contribute to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The overall percent of districts meeting these criteria for the FFY2011 reporting period is **0.3%**.

District level data for Indicator 4 are reported at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

---

The FFY2010 APR for Indicator 4 mistakenly reported that the minimum “n” size for Indicator 4B was 20. Last year’s calculation was correctly based on an “n” size of 10, however.
Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2010-2011 data):

**Indicator 4A**

Using data from school years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 (based the one year data lag required in Indicator 4 reporting, and Massachusetts’ definition of significant discrepancy incorporating two years of data into the determination), four school districts, or 1.1% of reporting districts, were determined to have a significant discrepancy in their rates of suspension and expulsion. This is slight slippage from last year’s reported rate of 0.56%, involving two school districts.

Despite this slippage, there has been relative consistency in the longitudinal reporting of the number of districts exceeding five times the state rate for student suspensions and expulsions for a single year, and in the annual state rate. In the FFY2009 and FFY2010 reporting periods, MASSDE flagged seven school districts as exceeding the state rate for a single year; the state rate has been relatively stable, at or near 1%, with a high of 1.3% last year.

MASSDE hypothesizes that the change in the reported overall rate of significant discrepancy reported in the APR is attributable to continued variability in school district data reporting practices and local disciplinary policies. Although state law requires school districts to have codes of student conduct, and certain disciplinary procedures that align with requirements under state law, disciplinary policies and decision-making are matters of local control. As a result, an infraction that might result in a student’s exclusion in one district may not result in removal in another district. Also, reporting of disciplinary data by schools districts is not uniform.

For the four 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, only one district was 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. This district did so and MASSDE determined that the district’s subsequent documentation included the required corrections and revisions of their policies, practices and procedures. MASSDE coordinated this process through Program Quality Assurance Services (PQA), the unit responsible for compliance monitoring and complaint resolution.

**MASSDE continues to have significant concerns about the validity and reliability of Indicator 4 data.** School districts report discipline information annually through the School Safety and Discipline Report (SSDR), an incident reporting system that includes disciplinary action for the following: (1) for any student for a drug or violence related incident; (2) for students with IEPs for any infraction; and (3) for any student if exclusion is more than 10 consecutive days, for incidents not reported under category (1). Despite data reporting instructions and support, MASSDE noted during the current and prior reporting periods that some districts use a higher standard for data reporting and submit data on removals for periods of time less than a school day, including removals for a single class period or less. This results in some over-reporting of school removals. Though the data are valid and reliable for what the data are reporting, reporting inconsistencies with the state’s standard have resulted in some inappropriate identification of districts as having a significant discrepancy in their rates of suspension and expulsion. This is increasingly apparent through the secondary analyses conducted by MASSDE, including the review of districts’ practices and procedures around student discipline. In these instances, MASSDE has determined that these districts are not out of compliance, there remain significant inconsistencies in reporting procedures at the local level. Improvement activities, including those discussed below, are intended to mitigate these inconsistencies and improve practice at the state and local levels.

**Indicator 4B**

For districts that have 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, Indicator 4B requires MASSDE to engage in a secondary analysis of policies, procedures, or practices (PPPs) to determine whether the PPPs contributed 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.

Using data from the FFY2011 reporting period (based on Massachusetts’ definition of significant discrepancy involving analysis data from three consecutive years, concluding with 2010-2011), MASSDE
conducted a secondary analysis for five school districts flagged as having a significant discrepancy. Of these, MASSDE identified only one district (0.3%) as having policies, practices, and procedures that may have contributed 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. This is progress over the FFY2010 Indicator 4B data, in which three districts (0.8%)\(^5\) were determined to meet the two-step criteria for identifying significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

**Improvement Activities**

**Verification of Correction of Noncompliance**

In the FFY2010 Response Table, OSEP instructed MASSDE to report here on the correction of noncompliance identified for this indicator for FFY2010. However, MASSDE made no findings of non-compliance, but rather focused on correction of local activities for reporting and consistency of reporting information. MASSDE remains concerned about the validity and reliability of Indicator 4 data because of the differences between districts’ reporting practices, and the variability of disciplinary definitions, policies, practices, and procedures at the local level. Because the State does not have confidence in the data as accurately representing actual district level practice, MASSDE has not issued findings of noncompliance for Indicator 4.

Even though no formal findings of noncompliance have been issued to school districts identified under the Indicator 4 measurements because of the data reporting standards noted above, as described in the FFY2010 APR for Indicator 4, MASSDE takes steps to review district policies, practices, and procedures to make sure that they are not resulting in inappropriate practices of suspension and expulsion. The Special Education Planning and Policy (SEPP) office works in cooperation with PQA to review the “flagged” districts’ compliance with federal and state laws regarding discipline for students with disabilities, and their correct implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As described in the FFY2010 APR for Indicator 4, MASSDE reviews findings made by PQA during the Coordinated Program Review (CPR) and Mid-Cycle Review (MCR) processes, as well as the complaint resolution process, to assess correct implementation of applicable regulatory requirements in the districts that have been identified as having significant discrepancy when compared to state rates of suspension and expulsion. In these processes, PQA identifies deficiencies in procedures and practices that may contribute to significant discrepancy, orders corrective actions, and conducts student records reviews to ensure that individual cases of noncompliance are addressed.

Until MASSDE’s is continuing to focus on efforts to improve data quality and collection practices to yield statewide Indicator 4 data that uses the same data reporting standards to accurately reflects accurately individual district numbers in a consistent manner, and will continue to use additional means of analyzing district level data and district practices for student disciplinary removals. Using secondary analyses of data and district practices, policies, and procedures, MASSDE does not feel confident to state that there is has not identified significant discrepancy in rates of suspension and exclusion and to make has not made findings of noncompliance against school districts. MASSDE will continue to engage in these additional strategies for identifying and correcting inappropriate practices.

**Additional Activities**

MASSDE has engaged in statewide efforts to improve the validity and reliability of Indicator 4 data collection and reporting by local districts to the State. Based on reviews of district practices, MASSDE has identified data variations which are the result of inconsistent definitions, policies, and procedures at the local level. Based on MASSDE’s review, such variations include, but are not limited to, inconsistent reporting of in-school suspensions or detentions, zero-tolerance policies, and “point systems” where classroom removal results from an accumulation of negative points from several infractions rather than a single incident. 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, including data related to bullying behaviors. Furthermore, MASSDE is targeting professional

---

\(^5\) The FFY2010 APR for Indicator 4B incorrectly stated that 0 districts met the criteria for significant discrepancy. Of the seven districts identified under part (a) of the measurement, three met the criteria of part (b). This actual target data were 0.8% of districts statewide.
development and technical assistance to ensure that districts have an improved understanding of alternatives to suspension.

As part of this coordinated work, MASSDE disseminated Technical Assistance Advisory SPED 2012-2: Improving Data and Practices Regarding Disciplinary Removals of Students with Disabilities, available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/12_2ta.html. This technical assistance memorandum clarifies disciplinary policies, practices, procedures, and definitions including, but not limited to, suspension that constitutes a removal and must be reported to MASSDE. The advisory also incorporates a district self-assessment of policies, procedures or practices that may possibly contribute to the number of students suspended for more than ten days or patterns of removal that represent a change in special education placement.

This self-assessment is available for any district, but will be required to be completed for school districts that are identified as having a rate of suspension and expulsion in excess of the state rate, consistent with the measurements of Indicator 4A and 4B. MASSDE will work with these districts to support their completion of the self-assessment and implementation of corrective actions that may be necessary to improve policies, practices, and procedures.

In addition, MASSDE has increased its efforts to design activities that benefit all students – those with or without IEPs – and align definitions, policies, procedures and intervention activities, wherever possible, to be consistent for all students. For instance, in June 2011, MASSDE created a new Office of Tiered System of Support (OTSS) focused on development of and implementation of the Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS). MTSS focuses on developing 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 have already demonstrated mastery of the concepts and skills being taught. OTSS developed and posted an MTSS Blueprint to assist districts with the implementation of supports for all students, and an MTSS district self-assessment tool to measure the level of implementation and fidelity of implementation of the tiers of supports. This self-assessment includes sections on: High Quality School-wide Behavior/Social Rules, Supports and Expectations and Student Support including School Culture, Family and Community Engagement and Problem Solving.

Other tools are made available through MASSDE’s Student Support Center, which created the Behavioral Health and Public Schools Self-Assessment Tool for Schools. This self-assessment tool is designed to assess current activities and strategies that create a supportive school environment. This tool is intended to assist with documenting current practices that support students’ behavioral health at all intervention levels, ranging from creating supportive school environments, to early interventions, to responding effectively to individual students who require more intensive services. It also examines the role of various school professionals and staff in providing these supports.

These collaborative efforts focused on improving data collection and reporting, and district practice for suspension and inclusion, will appropriately address continuous improvement for and compliance with Indicator 4 requirements.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2010-2011 data):

The MA SPP for Indicator 4 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 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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day (full inclusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Number of Students (148,764)</td>
<td>86,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Target Data</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Any variance between the data reported under IDEA section 618 data and the data reported for Indicator 5C is due to MASSDE’s decision not to include the number of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities in this indicator, which is consistent with the calculation MASSDE has used in previous reporting years.

District level data for Indicator 5 are reported at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).
Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

**Indicator 5A – Full Inclusion**

During the FFY2011 reporting period, the total number of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in Massachusetts was 148,764. Of those, **58.1%**, or 86,484 students, were served in the general education classroom for 80% or more of the school day. This is an increase of 0.2 percentage points from FFY2010, but falls just short of MASSDE’s target of serving 58.8% of students with IEPs in full inclusion settings (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>58.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>58.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Student Information Management System (SIMS).

In analyzing the data on full inclusion by district, MASSDE has found an apparent connection between school districts’ Massachusetts accountability levels (under our flexibility waiver) and rates of full inclusion for students with IEPs, with Level 3 and 4 districts (these are the lower levels of performance), demonstrating the lowest rates of students being served in general education classroom for 80% or more of the school day. This is particularly important in light of the findings in Dr. Thomas Hehir’s 2012 report (see Appendix A) reviewing special education in Massachusetts, in which data show that students with high incidence disabilities who spend more of their school day in the general education classroom with their nondisabled peers perform better on the MCAS tests than students with high incidence disabilities who spend a smaller proportion of their school day in the general education classroom.

As a result of this analysis, MASSDE is sponsoring many improvement activities aimed at increasing the rates of full inclusion across the Commonwealth, with a focus on Level 3 and 4 districts. Many of these improvement activities involve professional development opportunities and targeted assistance in the area of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), a framework through which teachers create instructional goals, methods, materials, and assessments that meet the needs of all learners and allow the greatest number of students access to the general curriculum. See Appendix A for further information about these and other relevant improvement activities.

**Indicator 5B – Substantially Separate Placements**

In FFY2011, **15.0%** of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 were served in the general education classroom for less than 40% of the day. While MASSDE did not meet its measurable and rigorous target
of serving no more than 14.5% of students with IEPs in substantially separate placements, this is a
decrease of 0.1 percentage points from the reported FFY2010 rate.

MASSDE’s data on substantially separate placements in FFY2011 follow the trend seen in previous
years: most students with IEPs who move to full inclusion come from the partial inclusion subgroup, rather
than from substantially separate placements. While the percentage of students with IEPs served in
general education classrooms for 40%-79% of the school day has continued to decrease during the SPP
period, the percentage of students in substantially separate placements has been nearly constant over
the last seven years. Figure 7 below, which depicts trends in the educational environments of students
with IEPs from FFY2004 to date, demonstrates the increase over time in full inclusion placements, with a
commensurate decrease in partial inclusion, as well as the relative stability in the rate of substantially
separate placements.

Figure 7:

**State Trends in Educational Environments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY 2004-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially Separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Student Information Management System (SIMS).

**Indicator 5C – Separate Schools, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements**
The percentage of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 who were served in separate schools,
residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements in FFY2011 was **6.8%** (10,189 students). This
was a 0.1 percentage point increase from FFY2011, or an increase of 174 students.

MASSDE did not meet this year’s rigorous target for Indicator 5C, but the data for FFY2011 are
consistent with the rate of placement of students with IEPs being educated in separate schools,
residential facilities, or homebound/hospital reported over the last seven years. Since baseline data for
Indicator 5C were collected in FFY2204, the rate of placement in separate schools, residential facilities, or
homebound/hospital has remained stable, hovering between 6.7% and 6.8% (see Figure 8). This
consistency is likely due, in large part, to the availability of high quality private schools for students with
disabilities in Massachusetts. Massachusetts has a strong system of private schools, as well as a
professional organization dedicated to serving students with disabilities, known as the Massachusetts
Association of Approved Private Schools (maaps).
In calculating the rate and number of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served 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. In this calculation MASSDE does not include students with disabilities who have been parentally-placed in private schools. Parentally-placed students with disabilities in private schools are also excluded from the denominators for the calculation of Indicators 5A, 5B, and 5C. This is consistent with the calculation method used by MASSDE in previous reporting years. Any discrepancy that may exist between the data reported under IDEA section 618 and the data reported for Indicator 5C is the result of this calculation method. Please note that the students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 counted under Indicator 5C do not include those students placed in correctional facilities.

**Improvement Activities**

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

The MA SPP for Indicator 5 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 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.

Baseline Data and Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Baseline Data and Measurable and Rigorous Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Percent of preschool students with IEPs receiving the majority of services in the early childhood program</td>
<td>B: Percent of preschool students attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Data FFY2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>26.0% 23.9% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,873 / 44,945 16,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.5% 14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,310 / 44,945 16,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

In the FFY2011 MA SPP, MASSDE is reporting new baseline data for Indicator 6 and setting targets for FFY2012 at its annual Special Education Steering Committee Meeting. MASSDE has no progress or slippage to report in the baseline year.

District level data for Indicator 6 will be reported at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx.

---

6 During the clarification period, an error in the data used for Indicator 6 calculations was identified. MASSDE corrected the error and has updated the baseline data for FFY2011. In addition, the proposed targets included in the SPP have been modified to reflect the new baseline data.
Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators. For this report, MASSDE would like to highlight several ongoing inter-agency initiatives that are aligned with efforts to to improve data quality and to ensure that young children are served in the least restrictive environment.

In FFY2011, Massachusetts and applied for and received a Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Fund Award of $50 million for its proposal: From Birth to School Readiness: Massachusetts Early Learning Plan, 2012-1015. This initiative will advance goal of ensuring that all children, particularly high-needs children, have access to quality pre-K education. Key strategies of the plan include:

- Aligning early education and grades k-3 to promote healthy child development,
- Implementing standards for early learning and development, including English language development standards for children from birth to age 5.
- Creating the Massachusetts Early Learning and Development Assessment System (MELD) for birth to grade three, including expanding screening for children and developing a common tool for kindergarten entry assessment.
- Providing targeted technical assistance and professional development opportunities to early childhood educators to enhance their effectiveness.
- Increasing engagement with parents, families, and community members that is culturally and linguistically appropriate.

In partnership with the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (MEEC), MASSDE supports professional development and technical assistance activities for school district personnel focused on Indicator 6 data collection and support of young children and families. To support data collection activities during the current school year, MASSDE has provided early childhood district personnel with training on the updated Educational Environment/Placement decision tree (also known as the PL2) that has been modified to realign the SIMS reporting codes with Indicator 6 reporting requirements. Districts accessed the technical assistance through webinars on how to properly code preschool student educational environments and placement to help ensure that student placement is reported accurately in this dataset.

Collaborative activities aligned with early childhood LRE and outcomes initiatives that were hosted by MEEC in FFY2011 including the following programs:

- Strengthening Families Approach to Working with Students with Disabilities - Five, 1-day sessions offered to communities of practice across Massachusetts that included individuals from public schools, early intervention programs, and early education and care programs. Sessions addressed ways to include the Strengthening Families Protective Factors approach in everyday practice.
- Social Emotional Management for Children on the Autism Spectrum - Four, 4-day sessions offered throughout the year including an introduction to Autism Spectrum Disorder and emphasis on how to individualize the curriculum, communication, and environment for these students in an inclusive early childhood setting.
- Peers in the Inclusive Classroom – A Dialogue on Programming - Five, 1-day sessions on how to use assessments and screenings to inform individualized instruction for children. Participants were members of the early literacy professional learning communities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 6 includes new baseline data for FFY2011 and targets for FFY2012 reflecting improvement over the baseline data. Targets were set with input from the Massachusetts Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. Also, the 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 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 = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

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

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

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

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

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 functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

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

Measurable and Rigorous Targets and Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statements</th>
<th>Actual FFY2010 (% and # children)</th>
<th>Actual FFY2011 (% and # children)</th>
<th>Target FFY2011 (% 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>76.9% n=2852</td>
<td>83.1% n=1108</td>
<td>87%</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>53.3% n=2852</td>
<td>54.4% n=1108</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</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 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} )</td>
<td>76.6% n=2853</td>
<td>83.3% n=1108</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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} )</td>
<td>56.8% n=2853</td>
<td>54.9% n=1108</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</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 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} )</td>
<td>78.9% n=2853</td>
<td>85.3% n=1108</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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} )</td>
<td>65.2% n=2853</td>
<td>66.5% n=1108</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Progress Data for Preschool Children FFY2011 (2011-2012):

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</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>12</td>
<td>1.1%</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>145</td>
<td>13.1%</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>348</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</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>13</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>139</td>
<td>12.5%</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>348</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</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>5</td>
<td>0.5%</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>117</td>
<td>10.6%</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>249</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

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

**Summary Statement 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.

The FFY2011 Summary Statement 1 result for Outcome A was **83.1%**, representing an increase of 6.2 percentage points over the FFY2010 result, but still 3.9 percentage points below the target of 87%. In FFY2010, MASSDE reported slippage on Summary Statement 1, Outcome A. However, the progress MASSDE made in FFY2011 represents not only a noteworthy increase over the FFY2010 results, but also an improvement over the FFY2009 results. Although MASSDE did not meet the FFY2011 target for Summary Statement 1, the progress made this year represents a substantial narrowing of the gap between the reported results and the measurable and rigorous targets MASSDE has set.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited the program.

The FFY2011 Summary Statement 2 result for Outcome A was **54.4%**, representing an increase of 1.1 percentage points over the FFY2010 result, but still more than 25 percentage points below the target of 80%. While this is an improvement over previous years’ results, it still is well below the target for FFY2011.

Figure 9 shows the distribution of COSF ratings at entry and exit for Outcome A in FFY2011.

**Figure 9: COSF Ratings at Entry and Exit for Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

**Progress Data for Outcome A:**

The progress data for all three outcomes show an interesting positive shift in the types of progress preschool children are making in Massachusetts. For Outcome A, while the percent of children who did not improve functioning (progress category a) remained unchanged from FFY2010, MASSDE saw notable improvement in both progress categories c and d with 31.4% of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach the level (an increase of 2.6 percentage points over FFY2010), and 38.4% of students who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers (an increase of 7.5 percentage points over FFY2010). Likewise, a smaller percentage of children (13.1% in FFY2011 compared to 16.7% in FFY2010) improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers (progress category b). MASSDE saw a decrease in the number of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.

These results are indicative of both an overall shift in the level of need among children reported in this cohort and improved results for Massachusetts students on Outcome A, positive social-emotional skills.
While fewer had a level of functioning comparable with their same-aged peers on entry, more children made significant progress in improving their functioning to attain a level of functioning near or comparable with their same aged peers. This result is consistent with Summary Statement 1 and the greater percentage of children who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited a program.

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

**Summary Statement 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.

The FFY2011 Summary Statement 1 result for Outcome B was **83.3%**, representing an increase of 6.7 percentage points over the FFY2010 result, but still 4.7 percentage points below the target of 88%. Similarly to Outcome A, the results on Outcome B indicate both a recovery from the slippage reported in the FFY2010 results and surpassing of the FFY2009 results.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they exited the program.

The FFY2011 Summary Statement 2 result for Outcome B was **54.9%**, representing a decrease of 1.9 percentage points from the FFY2010 result and 25.1 percentage points below the target of 80%. This is the only one of the six summary statements for this indicator for which MASSDE is reporting slippage.

A review of the results for Summary Statement 2 for Outcomes A and B for FFY2009, FFY2010, and FFY2011 indicates that the percentage of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they exited these programs has remained fairly consistent over time with a low of 52.5% for Summary Statement 2, Outcome A in FFY2009 and a high of 56.8% of children for Summary Statement 2, Outcome B in FFY2010. MASSDE continues to place great importance on ensuring better results for this age group and continues to develop the improvement activities discussed below to target this slippage in particular.

Figure 10 shows the distribution of COSF ratings at entry and exit for Outcome B.

**Figure 10: COSF Ratings at Entry and Exit for Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)**

![COSF Ratings at Entry and Exit for Outcome B](image)

Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 7 District Reported Student Outcomes Data.

**Progress Data for Outcome B:**

Similarly to Outcome A, the progress results for Outcome B indicate little to no change in progress category a, the percent of children who did not improve functioning (+0.2 percentage points). MASSDE saw a decrease in the number who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers (-8.2 percentage points), and a decrease in the number of children who improved functioning but not sufficiently to move nearer to their same-aged peers (-3.7 percentage points) compared to FFY2010.
Indicating improved outcomes for children, there were again considerable increases over FFY2010 in both progress categories c and d, the percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to their same-aged peers and either did not reach (+5.2 percentage points), or reached a comparable level of functioning (+6.4 percentage points). The smaller percentage of students entering at a level of functioning at a level comparable with their same age peers indicates a student population that was in need of a greater level of services than previous years.

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

**Summary Statement 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.

The FFY2011 Summary Statement 1 result for Outcome C was **85.3%**, representing an increase of 6.4 percentage points over the FFY2010 result but still 4.7 percentage points below the target of 90%.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they exited the program.

The FFY2011 Summary Statement 2 result for Outcome C was **66.5%**, representing an increase of 1.3 percentage points over the FFY2010. While this represents progress over previous years’ results, it is still 13.5 percentage points below the target of 80%.

Figure 11 shows the distribution of COSF ratings at entry and exit for Outcome C.

**Figure 11: COSF Ratings at Entry and Exit for Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

![Outcome C: COSF at Entry and Exit Rating Distribution for FFY2011](image)

*Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 7 District Reported Student Outcomes Data.*

**Progress Data for Outcome C:**

Outcome C saw the smallest percentage of children in progress category a, the percent of children who did not improve functioning, with only 0.5% of children meeting this criteria, a decrease of 0.4 percentage points from FFY2010. MASSDE also saw decreases in progress categories b (-2.4 percentage points) and e (-8.7 percentage points), indicating that fewer children are not improving their functioning to move nearer to their same-aged peers and that fewer children in the dataset are entering preschool with functioning similar to their same-aged peers. MASSDE has seen increases in progress categories c and d for Outcome C with substantial growth in progress category d in particular (+10.0 percentage points), the percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to their same-aged peers. MASSDE also saw improvement in progress category c of +1.6 percentage points.

Figure 12 presents the results for each summary statement for the three outcomes for the most recent three fiscal years and the FFY2011 targets. Although MASSDE reports progress over both the FFY2010 slippage and the FFY2009 results, MASSDE has yet to meet its targets for Outcomes A, B, or C. In the FFY2009 reporting year, MASSDE revised the FFY2010, FFY2011, and FFY2012 reporting requirements after exceeding the FFY2010 targets in FFY2009. These revised targets set even more rigorous
standards that reflect the importance MASSDE places on ensuring improved outcomes for this age group. While MASSDE is disappointed to not meet these targets, MASSDE has a number of ongoing improvement activities targeting these students.

Figure 12: Tracking Progress on Indicator 7 over Time and Against Targets

![Figure 12: Tracking Progress on Indicator 7 over Time and Against Targets](image)


Improvement Activities

Consistent with instruction from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators. MASSDE would like to highlight several activities from FFY2011 that have focused on improving the quality of data collection and reporting for this indicator, and early childhood outcomes.

Throughout the data collection and analysis process MASSDE provided technical assistance to district personnel and implemented additional processes to ensure the accuracy of reported data, including following up with districts whose data was questionable or incomplete. This report consists of information on 1108 students from 150 districts representing three of the for MASSDE cohorts. These school districts participated in training activities on data collection systems, including district’s use of the COS Calculator Model 2.0 - Analytic Versions with Expanded Descriptive Output and Summary Statements for 150 Cases (4/16/10). The Excel file created by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center can be used to generate OSEP progress category information on child outcomes. It also includes added functionality that allows districts to use summary form ratings data to generate OSEP progress category information on child outcomes, 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. Each district received training on how to input student data onto the spreadsheet, and instructions on how to transmit that data to MASSDE.

In addition to the functionality described above, this Excel workbook creates a summary of common data issues which filters the following data from the final calculations: children with missing entry dates, missing exit dates, or time in service of less than six months. It also notes which children have usable data on at least one outcome and those with usable data on all three outcomes. In the past, MASSDE filtered the data manually. 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 and helps to minimize human error.
In collaboration with the MEEC, MASSDE supported additional activities to support the work of Indicator 7 and improved early childhood outcomes. School district staff, early intervention program staff, families, and early education and care providers participated in a professional development programs that included: Strengthening Families Approach to Working with Students with Disabilities; Social Emotional Management for Children on the Autism Spectrum; Brain Building and Early Literacy and Numeracy; Strategies and Supports for Young Children (Birth to 8) Conference; Peers in the Inclusive Classroom – A Dialogue on Programming; Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Training Sessions; and Early Childhood Special Education – Embedding Early Childhood Outcomes into Practice Using the SpecialQuest Approach.

Additional information about these activities, and the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge, is available in the FFY2011 APR for Indicator 7.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 7 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 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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>80,776</td>
<td>5,824</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>82.5%</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 items for parents of students with disabilities in preschool through grade 6; 15 of 29 items for parents of students with disabilities in middle school, high school and post high school).

In FFY2011, MASSDE surveyed two cohorts, totaling 208 school districts, using the revised parent survey tool and methodology that were implemented in FFY2010. Of parents of students with disabilities responding to the survey, 82.5% reported that schools facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. MASSDE did not meet the FFY2011 measurable and rigorous target of 83%.

District level data for Indicator 8 are reported at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

In FFY2011, the percentage of surveys meeting the established standard was 0.5 percentage points below the measurable and rigorous target for the reporting period. This result (82.5%) is relatively consistent with the most recently reported FFY2010 parent agreement rate of 83%, and reflects a consistent trend in being at or near the standard since the baseline was established in FFY2005 and since the survey process was redesigned in FFY2009, as illustrated in Figure 13.
Figure 13:

Parents Reporting that Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement as a Means of Improving Services and Results for Children with Disabilities


MASSDE recognizes that the survey results might provide helpful information to the State and school districts about how parents regard districts’ efforts to involve them in their children’s education and the life of the school. However, MASSDE continues to be disappointed at the response rate overall, which affects the utility of the information received significantly at the local level.

Each participating school district receives a tailored report that contains information regarding survey items to which parents responded most positively, as well as items where parents indicated more efforts could be directed towards family engagement. The reports contain the following data: number of surveys received, overall response rate, demographics of respondents, percentage and number received for each survey item, the range of responses (scale of Very Strongly Agree to Very Strongly Disagree), description and percentage of respondents by disability, description and percentage of respondents by educational placement, percentages of responses by grade level (early childhood, elementary, middle, high and post-high), and the spread of responses across each level. In addition, district data is compared to the state-level data. MASSDE encourages school districts to use that information to develop and implement activities designed to increase parent involvement and family engagement, as well as increase the response rate.

While the return rates overall are statistically representative of the state according to the third party analysts working with MASSDE, participating school districts have stated that return rates at the local level have not always yielded sufficient numbers of parents responding to allow the districts to use the information most effectively to improve district partnership activities. MASSDE has continued to use this feedback to engage in regular review of the parent survey instrument and data collection processes in order to develop recommendations for revision, and to identify ways to support districts in their efforts to increase the survey response rate and parent involvement.

MASSDE and stakeholders have been analyzing closely the return rates of surveys by language for each year of the SPP. FFY2011 data show that return rates were lower overall, particularly from non-English speaking parents. This likely reflects difficulties associated with using an on-line survey to access a multilingual parent population. Interestingly, an item with the highest level of parent agreement was related to school personnel respecting cultural heritage. This is useful information as MASSDE is currently assessing strategies that target this population of parents.

MASSDE also uses survey results to inform its activities in other areas. Survey results reveal that transition – Part C to Part B and secondary transition – continues to be an area of low agreement. The agreement rates for the following survey questions were among the lowest for the early childhood/elementary and middle/high school parents, respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The district had supports in place to assist me and my child as my child moved from an IFSP to an IEP. General agreement - 72.7%. Parents of students in separate schools 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. General agreement - 51.6% agreement. Parents with students in a separate school reported more agreement with this item.

These results underscore the importance of providing information and supports in the areas of early childhood transition (Indicator 12) and secondary transition (Indicator 13), consistent with the agency’s priority for supporting the development and implementation of family, school, and community collaborative partnerships to strengthen schools and improve student achievement by increasing opportunities for families to be more involved in their children's learning.

Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

MASSDE would like to highlight an improvement activity that is part of the agency’s work to improve family engagement in our schools. MASSDE is committed to increasing the response rate as a means of also escalating the agreement rate through improved family engagement activities and policies in the school districts. Recognizing the important role of local parent advocacy groups and special education interest groups in survey dissemination and awareness, MASSDE is creating technical assistance resources about ways to involve stakeholder groups in the survey process. To that end, MASSDE is developing additional technical assistance focusing on strategies to increase parent involvement survey response rates and family engagement in the schools.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 8 has been revised to include 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 = \([(\# \text{ of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification}) \div (\# \text{ of districts in the State})]\) 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, procedures, and practices (PPPs) for identifying students as disabled.


The state uses a minimum cell size of 20 for each race/ethnic group in every district. A cell of Cells less than 20, though removed from the calculation, are is reviewed individually reviewed to see if data irregularities for specific racial and ethnic groups in these districts would suggests disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. All cells of greater than 20 are retained in the data set and are used to calculate disproportionate representation. 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.

All districts identified by way of this quantitative analysis are then subject to a review of the appropriateness of their 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. If the reviewers conclude 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.

### FFY Measurable and Rigorous Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Districts</th>
<th>Number of Districts with Disproportionate Representation</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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>± 0</td>
<td>± 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the two districts with disproportionate representation, MASSDE has determined that one district’s PPPs were appropriate and did not contribute to the over-representation of racial/ethnic groups identified for special education and related services. As of the date of this report, MASSDE is reviewing the other district’s PPPs; final data will be reported during the April clarification period.

District level data for Indicator 9 are reported at http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Massachusetts used the October 1, 2011 enrollment and child count data to calculate disproportionality in the FFY2011 APR. In this reporting period, one out of 400 districts were excluded from the numerator as a result of the minimum n size requirement; all districts were included in the denominator.

Using the measurement criteria established above, MASSDE determined that two districts met the data threshold for disproportionate over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. MASSDE is in the process of reviewing these district’s policies, practices and procedures to determine which disproportionate representation, if any, were the result of the inappropriate identification. Upon review of policies, practices, and procedures using the process described above, MASSDE determined that 0% of the districts had disproportionate over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was due to inappropriate identification. In FFY 2011, MASSDE met its measurable and rigorous target.

Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators. MASSDE would like to highlight several activities that have been relevant to supporting improved data collection and use for addressing disproportionality in identification.

The reviewers of Indicators 9 and 10 have collaborated with various internal offices that conduct similar reviews of special education PPPs in order to align our review methodologies. For example, as part of the charter renewal process, charter schools undergo a federal programs renewal inspection visit that examines in detail the school’s implementation of curricular accommodations and modifications, including how special education and English language learner (ELL) programs meet the needs of students and how program effectiveness is evaluated by the school. The information contained in the federal programs renewal inspection report is included in the school’s Summary of Review, a document created by the MASSDE Charter School Office to assist the commissioner and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education with their analysis of and decisions regarding charter renewal applications. The information derived from the report of charter schools is an additional source of information analysts working on Indicators 9 and 10 use to determine whether charter schools, if found to have disproportionate representation, have inappropriate PPPs for special education eligibility determination and disability identification. Analysts work similarly with PQA to review information contained in Coordinated Program Review (CPR) and Mid-cycle Review (MCR) reports.

Additionally MASSDE continues to work on increasing the validity and reliability of the disproportionality data for Indicators 9 and 10. In Massachusetts, it is common for vocational school districts, most of which serve grades 9-12, to “inherit” large numbers of special education students from their “sending districts” (i.e., students who elect to enroll in the vocational school district as opposed to the public district in which
they reside). Because movement of students from one district to another for a variety of reasons is always occurring, looking only at current enrollment of special education students does not accurately identify whether the initial evaluation for that student occurred in the same district. Ultimately, vocational school districts end up having some of the highest disproportionality rates in the Commonwealth, despite the fact that they rarely conduct initial special education evaluations. Additionally, charter schools are frequently flagged in the disproportionality analysis for similar reasons. In these circumstances, districts are being identified for possible disproportionality in identification when the districts have not conducted the initial evaluations; in other words, districts are held accountable for other districts’ PPPs.

Not only is there confusion at the state-level, districts are struggling to understand why they have been flagged for disproportionate representation when the districts rarely conduct initial evaluations. Below are responses from charter school districts and vocational school districts when asked by MASSDE for their PPPs:

(Flagged for disproportionate representation of White students in Health-related disabilities) – "In the last six academic years, my vocational school district has conducted an average of 6.25 initial evaluations to determine eligibility for special education services. In the years analyzed, there was never more than one student found to have a Health-related disability and eligible to receive special education services. During the 2011-12 school year, seven students received initial evaluation. Not one of those students was found to be eligible for special education services due to a Health-related disability."

(Flagged for disproportionate representation of White student in Health-related disabilities) – "As a public vocational/technical high school, we have little control over the demographics of our student body, other than to reject those students who do not meet the minimum application requirement...some of our sending districts encourage special education students more strongly than other students who may consider applying to a vocational school. Consequently, our student body has an over-representation of special needs students and within that category, students who have been identified as having a Health-related disability (usually through a diagnosis of ADD/ADHD)."

(Flagged for disproportionate representation of White students in Health-related disabilities) – "Our charter school district serves students in grades 5 – 12. For this reason, the majority of students receiving special education services have already had their primary disability determined through their sending district. Out of the 30 students enrolled in special education with a primary disability of health impairment, only 3 are students who were determined eligible through an initial evaluation at our charter school district."

Given this extenuating circumstance, MASSDE has developed two alternative methods of determining disproportionate representation that incorporate initial evaluation data. Both methods have been submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and/or the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) for review and have been rejected. In order to efficiently and effectively identify disproportionality, MASSDE believes it is essential to correctly determine which district is doing the initial evaluation rather than do calculations based on enrollment data, MASSDE will be seeking additional technical assistance to determine how to incorporate a better statistical model. MASSDE notes that a very deep statistical analysis conducted by Dr. Thomas Hehir (former OSEP Director) and his associates at Harvard University for MASSDE did not find evidence of disproportionate representation in Massachusetts. MASSDE will continue to provide data based on the accepted statistical analysis until a more useable and meaningful analysis for the state and for school districts has been determined.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, and resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives. Additionally, MASSDE has included a reference in the MA SPP that, beginning in FFY2011, the measurement no longer includes underrepresentation.
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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

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

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 (PPPs) 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, though removed from the calculation, are reviewed individually to see if data irregularities for specific racial and ethnic groups in these districts would suggest disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. All cells of greater than 10 are retained in the data set and are used to calculate disproportionate representation. 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.

All districts identified by way of this quantitative analysis are then subject to a review of the appropriateness of their 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. If the reviewers conclude 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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the ten districts with disproportionate representation, MASSDE has determined that nine districts’ PPPs were appropriate and did not contribute to the over-representation of racial/ethnic groups identified for special education and related services. As of the date of this report, MASSDE is reviewing the other district’s PPPs; final data will be reported during the April clarification period.

District level data for Indicator 10 are reported at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

Massachusetts used the October 1, 2011 enrollment and child count data to calculate disproportionality in the FFY2011 APR. In this reporting period, 17 out of 400 districts were excluded from the numerator as a result of the minimum n size requirement; all districts were included in the denominator.

Using the measurement criteria established above, MASSDE determined that 10 districts met the data threshold for disproportionate over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. MASSDE is in the process of reviewing these districts’ policies, practices and procedures to determine which disproportionate representation, if any, were the result of the inappropriate identification. Upon review of policies, practices, and procedures using the process described above, MASSDE determined that 0.0% of the districts had disproportionate over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that were due to inappropriate identification. In FFY 2011, MASSDE met its measurable and rigorous target.

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Because States may report on one set of improvement activities covering Indicators 9 and 10 in cases where the improvement activities are the same or overlap, MASSDE’s description of additional activities that are relevant to improving data collection and addressing disproportionality in identification for Indicators 9 and 10 are described in the MA APR for Indicator 9.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

The MA SPP includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, and resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives. Additionally, MASSDE has included a reference in the MA SPP that, beginning in FFY2011, the measurement no longer includes underrepresentation.
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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

a. Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received 3022

b. Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timelines) 2832

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established-timeline) 93.7%

Percent = [3022 divided by 2832] times 100.

The FFY2011 data is based on a cohort of school districts reporting on initial evaluations that were begun in the months of October, November, and December, 2011. Data collection procedures are described in the MA SPP for Indicator 11. If a student’s evaluation was completed 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.

District level data for Indicator 11 are reported at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that Occurred for FFY2011:**

During the FFY2011 data collection period, cohort school districts received parental consent for initial evaluation for 3,022 students. Of those, 2,832 students’ evaluations, or 93.7%, were completed timely. While this is a decrease of 1.1 percentage point over the FFY2010 actual target data, it is not significant slippage and is a reasonable variation between different cohorts.

In FFY2011, there were 190 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.
Of the 3,022 initial evaluations completed, 1,905 students, or 63%, were deemed to be eligible for special education services. This is notable because it is an increase of four percentage points from FFY2010 data. Of these, 1,789, or approximately 94%, were completed within the state established timelines or a timeline that was appropriately extended. This data is generally consistent with data reported for FFY2010. When timelines were not met due to circumstances over which the school districts did not have control – including delays due to school closures for weather or unanticipated emergencies, parent scheduling needs or parents missing a scheduled meeting, extended student absences or student illnesses, and evaluations extended with agreement of the parents -- MASSDE has determined that delays beyond the state-established 45-school working day requirement for evaluation do not result in noncompliance. In contrast, a delay that results from a circumstance within the school district’s control is deemed to be an unacceptable reason for extending the established timeframe for initial evaluation. As illustrated in Table 6 below, in FFY2011 school districts most often claimed that unavailability of staff to complete evaluations was the reason for missing the state-established timeline.

Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for District Delay in Meeting Timelines: Matters Within School Districts’ Control</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient staff availability to complete the evaluation on time (excessive caseload)</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay due to district’s scheduling need or conflict</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay due to evaluator reports not received on time</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay due to lack of qualified staff to complete the evaluation on time</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other” (e.g., need for bilingual evaluator)</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

In FFY2011, 36.8% of unacceptable delays cited were due to “insufficient staff” or “excessive caseload.” While the reasons given in FFY2010 and FFY2011 for delayed evaluations are similar, FFY2011 data show decrease of almost ten percentage points from FFY2010 (47.6%) for these reasons for delay. Unavailability of resources does not justify a district’s noncompliance. MASSDE will continue to work with school districts to ensure that students’ needs are timely met. MASSDE remains committed to assisting school districts in meeting the State’s measurable and rigorous target by support school districts’ analysis of root causes of noncompliance so that targeted improvement activities can be more closely assigned to causal factors.

Improvement Activities

Verification of Correction of Noncompliance

As instructed by OSEP in the Massachusetts Part B FFY2010 SPP/APR Response Table, MASSDE is required to report on actions taken to verify correction of noncompliance identified in FFY2010 data for Indicator 11. Based on FFY2010 data, MASSDE issued five findings of non-compliance in March, 2012. MASSDE is currently assessing the data and subsequent evidence of correction submitted by each district to verify that the districts have corrected identified noncompliance in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Correction of noncompliance identified in the current reporting period will be discussed in the FFY2012 APR. As of the date of this report, the one year correction period remains open. MASSDE is currently providing technical assistance to these identified districts and monitoring subsequent data sets and corrective action plans in order to verify that the school districts have taken appropriate actions to correct the identified noncompliance within one year of the finding. MASSDE will report on the correction of this noncompliance in the April SPP/APR clarification period, or in next year’s APR. Any findings made based on FFY2011 data will be reported in the FFY2012 APR for Indicator 11.
Additional Improvement Activities

Consistent with instruction from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

For purposes of this report, MASSDE would like to highlight the technical assistance opportunities that were provided in FFY2011 for local districts to incorporate data collection for SPP/APR into a continuous cycle of improvement. The activities included new webinar trainings and conference calls with district personnel to improve data collection activities, to conduct root cause analyses, and to identify additional corrective actions to address noncompliance. Additionally, MASSDE has begun a district level self-assessment for local administrators to gauge how current policies and procedures affect child find and eligibility practices. These activities will continue in FFY2012.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 11 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: 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 parental refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under 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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination = 367

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays = 59

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays = 236

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied = 39

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays = 17

Percent = [(236) divided by (367 – 59 – 39 – 17) X 100] = 93.7%

For FFY2011, 93.7% of the reported children 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 cohort 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 the reported delay. Sixteen children (4%) in seven districts did not have an IEP implemented by their third birthday. The analysis of the range of days beyond the child’s third birthday is as follows:
• Less than ten days after the student’s third birthday - one child in one district
• Eleven to 31 days after the students’ third birthday - three children in three districts
• More than 31 days after the students’ third birthday – 12 children in six districts

Of these, the reported reason for delay for 13 children (81.3%) included a late referral from Part C early intervention services to the local school district. Other reasons included delay in district scheduling, student illness, and other types of “parent” delay. MASSDE continues to work with cohort districts to provide training and other best practice resources about ways to mitigate delays to ensure that services are identified and implemented on time for eligible children.

District level data for Indicator 12 are reported at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

In FFY2011, the participating cohort districts reported a 93.7% compliance rate, indicating progress of 7.6 percentage points from the FFY2010 rate of 86.1%. Based on its analysis of these results and responses received from cohort school districts, MASSDE considers this progress in meeting timelines for Part C to Part B transition to be related to improved technical assistance to school districts and an enhanced collaborative approach to professional development and training between MASSDE and corresponding Part C stakeholders.

Improvement is also attributable to MASSDE’s enhancement of the data collection tool. MASSDE identified limitations in last year’s SmartForm data collection tool that were likely to have contributed to the drop in last year’s compliance data (86.1% in FFY2010, compared to 94% in FFY2009 and 93.7% in this year’s report). In making these changes, MASSDE has worked to ensure that this year’s reported rate of compliance is more consistent with districts’ practice. Additionally, MASSDE attributes some natural variation in annual data reported because data collection is accomplished through a cohort model; nominal variation between cohorts is expected. Because the reported results that are below the measurable and rigorous target of 100%, MASSDE recognizes that there is a continued need for training and technical assistance to improve data collection and compliance.

Improvement Activities

Correction of Noncompliance

As instructed in the Massachusetts Part B FFY2010 SPP/APR Response Table, MASSDE is required to report on actions taken to verify correction of noncompliance identified in FFY2010. Last year MASSDE reported no new findings of noncompliance, however; noncompliance identified was attributable to the same district for which a finding of noncompliance was issued based on FFY2009 data for Indicator 12. Therefore, the earlier finding remained open. The school district’s FFY2011 data also reflected noncompliance, and will be incorporated into the open noncompliance finding.

MASSDE is engaged in long-term corrective actions with this school district, in coordination with the agency’s PQA unit, which also cited the district for noncompliance in this area in a recent coordinated program review. MASSDE is continuing to support the school district in its review of policies, practices and procedures which may have contributed to the delay in IEP development and implementation by the children’s third birthday. By coordinating corrective actions through PQA, MASSDE is ensuring that the district receives appropriate technical assistance and support for its corrective actions so the district can demonstrate that it (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) based on a review of updated data that has been collected through a coordinated program review process; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the school district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Additional Improvement Activities

Consistent with instruction from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.
For purposes of this report, MASSDE would like to highlight an activity that has supported Part C to Part B transition for young children. In partnership with MEEC and the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH), MASSDE sponsored several professional development activities for EI partners and school districts to support successful transition from Part C to Part B. Local partners in the data collection cohort attended transition forums in spring 2012 in which partners coordinated policies and practices, and also worked on developing local Memoranda of Understanding focused on facilitating smooth early childhood transitions for families. From questions that were asked in these sessions, the agency partners developed and disseminated to local agencies an early childhood transition frequently asked questions document. These successful technical assistance and professional development programs, which also highlighted the new Part C regulations, will continue in FFY2012.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 12 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: 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 = \[
\frac{(# \text{ of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority})}{(# \text{ of youth with an IEP age 16 and above})}\] times 100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<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>1470</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District level data for Indicator 13 are reported at [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/special_ed.aspx).
Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target that occurred in FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Massachusetts is committed to ensuring that appropriate transition planning occurs for every student. This year's compliance rate of **99.2%** is consistent with last year’s rate of 99.1% and is 2.2 percentage points higher than the new baseline rate of 97% established in FFY2009. Maintenance of this relatively high compliance rate is due to intensive and targeted district-level verification and correction activities. In addition, MASSDE revised the Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist and created new checklist instructions for FFY2011 data collection (see Appendix C B) to ensure greater ease of use while maintaining the checklist’s utility as a robust data collection tool. However, because MASSDE is not reporting 100% compliance of participating cohort districts with the FFY2011 data, MASSDE has reviewed and will work to improve its data collection protocols and ongoing professional development and technical assistance for districts. During FFY2011, MASSDE engaged in several new secondary transition improvement activities, described below.

MASSDE’s disaggregated data analysis of the cohort data submitted for FFY2011 reveals many areas of significant strength statewide, as well as some areas needing improvement. For example, 100% of districts report that 100% of students are invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed, and 100% of districts report that 100% of student records display evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency is invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. Of all students with IEPs aged 16-22, 99.7% are reported to have received transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable them to meet their postsecondary goals, and 99.7% of all students are reported to have annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. Additionally, 99% of all students are reported to have appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals based on age-appropriate transition assessment.

**Improvement Activities**

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators. Several other activities have been especially focused on supporting state and local efforts to achieve 100% compliance with Indicator 13.

MASSDE continues to provide districts with high quality technical assistance and professional development that is both broad-based and individualized to areas of need brought to light through data collection and analysis. In FFY2011, MASSDE engaged in several new activities in order to maintain high levels of compliance related to effective secondary transition. MASSDE convened a statewide stakeholder meeting in May 2012 to solicit feedback on the Massachusetts Transition Planning Form (28M/9) and the IEP for secondary transition. MASSDE also revised the Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist and created new checklist instructions for FFY2011 data collection, new postsecondary goals examples, and a list of age-appropriate secondary transition assessments.

Also of note is the passage by the Massachusetts state legislature in March 2012 of Chapter 51 of the Acts of 2012, An Act to Promote the Successful Transition of Students with Disabilities to Post-Secondary Education, Employment and Independent Living. Chapter 51 creates a specialist teacher endorsement in transition services to facilitate provision of a coordinated set of activities to adequately prepare students with disabilities to achieve successful transition to post-school activities. The Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted new regulations regarding this endorsement in the fall of 2012.

**Verification of Correction of Noncompliance**

In FFY2010, MASSDE reported a compliance rate of 99.1%. Two districts were found to be in noncompliance with the requirements of Indicator 13 and were notified by letter on April 9, 2012. Therefore, corrective actions **must be were to have been** completed as soon as possible, but in no case later than April 9, 2013.

Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, districts that received a finding of noncompliance under Indicator 13 were instructed to submit hard copy documentation to MASSDE as evidence that 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).

MASSDE has determined that the two districts for which findings were made based on FFY2010 data have not timely corrected the identified noncompliance. While both districts participated in professional development activities on secondary transition by MASSDE staff and other experts in the field and engaged in other correction action processes, and one district has demonstrated improvement in complying with the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.320, neither district has submitted data demonstrating 100% compliance. MASSDE has kept these findings open, and will require the districts to take additional corrective actions to address these issues. If all conditions and criteria are met within one year of the finding of noncompliance, MASSDE will consider the noncompliance identified in FFY2010 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 in the FFY2012 APR on the verification of correction of noncompliance activities both FFY2010 FFY2011 data for these districts and for the school district to which a finding was issued based on the FFY2011 data in the FFY2012 APR for Indicator for 13.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 13 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: 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 = \(\frac{\text{(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}}\) times 100.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Measurable and Rigorous Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>A: Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school (Definition I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Target Data</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Numbers</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY2011 is the third 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
Of the 2,369 (3,019) students with disabilities in the exiting cohort, school districts reported survey responses from 1,277 (1,304), representing a response rate of 54% (43.1%). Respondents reported post-secondary engagement in one of the following unduplicated categories:

I. **Higher Education** means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (2-year program), or college/university (4- or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school = 545 (535).

II. **Competitive Employment** means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school, including military employment = 368 (378).

III. **Other Postsecondary Education or Training** means youth enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, or vocational technical school which is less than a 2-year program) = 58.

IV. **Some Other Employment** means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.) = 165.

V. Respondents not engaged in a manner meeting the definitions included in Indicator 14 = 182 (163).

Figure 14 below provides a visual representation of the respondent data by outcome category.

**Figure 14:**

```
Percent of FFY2011 Respondents by Outcome Categories

I. Higher Education 42%
II. Competitive Employment 30%
III. Other Education or Training 5%
IV. Some Other Employment 13%
V. Not Engaged 10%

Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes Survey.
```

While the data for students with disabilities attending CVTE is incorporated into the aggregate data reported above, outcomes data for the 243 students exiting CVTEs that were surveyed in FFY2011 are as follows:

- 4.5% of respondents (or 11) were engaged in the military full time.
- 48.9% (or 119) were employed, and of those exiters, nine also attended a 4-year college, 25 also attended a 2-year college, two also attended a technical school, and five also attended an apprenticeship program.
- 28.8% (or 70) were not in the labor force. Of those respondents, 15 attended a 4-year college, 22 attended a 2-year college, and five attended a technical school.
Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Slippage, if State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Analysis of the FFY2011 data and the FFY2010 data reveals that the number of students meeting the definition of both higher education and competitive employment are very similar for both years. In FFY2011 there was an increase of almost 100 in the number of students who responded to the survey indicating that they were engaged in other education and training or other employment. The greatest discrepancy between this and the previous reporting year was in the comparison of the number of students in the cohort and the corresponding response rates. The response rate for FFY2011 was 53.9% (see Footnote 6); for FFY2010 it was 35.5%. These figures are illustrated in Table 7.

MASSDE notes that school districts have continued to report improved post-secondary outcomes for students with disabilities aligned with the Indicator 14 priority areas for engagement. Each year, data show that more students are attending institutes of higher education (528 in FFY2010 and 535 in FFY2011) and are participating in competitive employment (304 in FFY2010 and 378 in FFY2011).

Table 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Students: Measurement A</th>
<th># Students: Measurement B</th>
<th># Students: Measurement C</th>
<th>Total # of Responses</th>
<th>Total # Students in Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY2010</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>2923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY2011</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>833 193</td>
<td>1095 1052</td>
<td>2399 3109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Massachusetts did not meet FFY2011 targets for Measurements A and B, MASSDE’s overall engagement rate for students enrolled in higher education or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (Measurement C) for FFY2011 was **85.7%** and **86.9%**, which exceeded the measurable and rigorous target of 84%.

Figure 15 below provides comparison of the actual cohort data from the last three reporting years, since the change in the measurement definitions. It is notable that the percentage of respondents who are report post-secondary engagements by the Indicator 14 measurements continues to rise.

Figure 15:

Source: Massachusetts Part B Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes Survey
In FFY2011, 182 / 163 (25.3% 32%) of the respondent leavers were categorized as not engaged. Of that group, 46 / 59 (25.3% 32%) stated that they were looking for a job; 38 / 60 (20.9% 32.6%) did not report they were looking for jobs; two had finished a college course; three were in job training programs; one was in a sheltered work program, and one was doing volunteer work. Others provided insufficient information to be able to capture their level of post-secondary engagement.

In FFY2011, the non-responders made up 46% 55.7% (1,092 / 1,655) of the cohort. While districts participating in the FFY2011 data collection were required to collect contact information from the FFY2011 leavers at the end of their final year (Spring 2011) in an effort to be prepared for this data collection, MASSDE notes that school districts’ ability to reach a large number of exiters remains a challenge for data collection activities. For example, one of Massachusetts’s largest districts reported a response rate below 1% in this reporting cycle and expressed difficulty in locating exiters using the contact information collected prior to the students’ exit. MASSDE is working with this district and others to develop additional resources and assist school districts with developing improved data collection policies and practices that will better capture the post-school outcomes of their former students. MASSDE looks forward to reporting continued improvement in the Indicator 14 response rate in future data collection cycles.

The highest rates of response were from exiters reported in the following disability categories:

- Specific Learning Disabilities - 35.3% 37.3%,
- Emotional Impairment - 45.0% 15.1%, and
- Health Impairment - 12.2%.

The lowest response rate was from the Sensory Disabilities categories. There were only 20 / 21 respondents from the Hard of Hearing, Sensory: Deaf-Blind, Vision Impairment and/or Blind communities. Additionally, students with English as a primary language made up 65.5% over 65% of the responses, with none of the other 18 reported languages reaching a response rate over 7%. MASSDE will work with districts to insure that the student survey is available in multiple languages, and is presented using multiple ways of representation in order to provide equal access to all our students.

### Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators. For this report, MASSDE would like to highlight ongoing improvement activities that support data collection for Indicator 14 and are focused on improving post-school outcomes for students with disabilities.

MASSDE has revised the MA Post-School Outcomes survey instrument to incorporate the list of possible reasons for why youth are not meeting the federal criteria to be considered competitively employed. Additionally, to facilitate school districts’ Indicator 14 data collection activities, MASSDE provides participating cohort districts with step-by-step instructions on the requirement of the indicator, teleconference presentations, a sample script for district personnel, and a student flyer containing information about the survey.

Additional activities supporting improved post-secondary outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities, are described more fully in the FFY2011 APRs for Indicators 1, 2, and 13, and in Appendix A of this report.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

The MA SPP for Indicator 14 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: 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:
- # of findings of noncompliance.
- # 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>2011</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2011-2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012, based on findings of noncompliance made in July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY2011 (2011-2012)</th>
<th>(a) Findings of Noncompliance Findings⁷</th>
<th>(b) Corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year of identification</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Of the 545 noncompliance findings made between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011, 544, or 99.8%, were corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year of identification. The single finding of noncompliance that was not timely corrected was made through Indicator 12 data review conducted by the MASSDE SEPP office. This finding and the status of its correction is described more fully in the MA APR for Indicator 12.

The data are reported in the Indicator 15 Worksheet for FFY2011, included here as Appendix B C.

---

⁷ Findings of special education noncompliance are made through the Problem Resolution System (PRS), Coordinator Program Reviews (CPRs), Mid-cycle Reviews (MCRs), State Performance Plan compliance indicators, or the Bureau of Special Education Appeals (BSEA).
Improvement Activities

Consistent with instruction from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

For purposes of this report, MASSDE would like to highlight an activity that has supported identification and correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year from identification. PQA, the unit engaged in compliance monitoring and management of the State’s complaint management system, has increased its efforts to support timely correction of identified noncompliance through training activities and direct technical assistance to school districts and charter schools on applying root cause analysis to noncompliance. This allows schools and districts to increase their capacity to resolve non-compliance in a targeted and meaningful way to ensure that districts are correctly implementing applicable regulatory requirements.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 15 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: 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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<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>212</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 13-6 and the Part B State Performance (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part B Indicator Measurement Table, Indicator 16 has been deleted from the SPP/APR, effective with this FFY2011 submission. However, in the interest of consistency with prior SPPs/APRs, MASSDE has chosen to continue to include specific information in the FFY2011 APR.

MASSDE reported through the IDEA Part B – Dispute Resolution, School Year: 2011-2012 Table (see Appendix D) that of the 212 complaints with reports issued, 209 reports were issued within timelines and three reports were issued within extended timelines. The percent of signed, written complaints with reports issued within appropriate timelines was **100%**.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the state did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Because Massachusetts met its target for FFY2011, MASSDE is not required to report on slippage or improvement activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 16 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: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

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

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

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<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>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 13-6 and the Part B State Performance (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part B Indicator Measurement Table, Indicator 17 has been deleted from the SPP/APR, effective with this FFY2011 submission. However, in the interest of consistency with prior SPPs/APRs, MASSDE has chosen to continue to report on this indicator for FFY2011.

MASSDE reported through the IDEA Part B – Dispute Resolution, School Year: 2011-2012 Table (see Appendix D) that of the 18 hearings fully adjudicated in this period by the Bureau of Special Education Appeals (BSEA), 17 were issued within timelines, including extended timelines. This is a compliance rate of 94.4%.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Since the beginning of the State Performance Plan (SPP) reporting cycle in FFY2004, MASSDE has reported compliance rates for Indicator 17 at target or just below target. Failure to achieve 100% compliance in a reporting year, including in FFY2011, has been the result of a single late decision in that period, issued no more than several days outside of the hearing timeline. Because the number of reported decisions included in the measurement is so small, failure to meet timelines for a single decision – as was the case here – can reduce the state’s rate of compliance by more than five percentage points.
Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

Some activities that have helped to ensure that Massachusetts is able to demonstrate consistently high levels of compliance for this indicator are administrative procedures and reporting requirements for managing case assignments and tracking timelines. Any failure to meet timelines has not been the result of systemic failures of administrative systems, policies, and procedures for managing due process hearing requests. The BSEA will continue to work toward 100% compliance.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 17 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: 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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>48% - 58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution meetings held</th>
<th>Number of resolution session settlement agreements</th>
<th>Percent of hearing requests that when to resolution session resolved through resolution session agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet the target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The BSEA reported through the IDEA Part B – Dispute Resolution, School Year: 2011-2012 Table (see Appendix D) that of the 48 resolution meetings held, 22 resulted in a written resolution session agreement during the reporting period. Although this rate of 45.8% falls below the measurable and rigorous target range, the difference is not statistically representative of any substantive change in the quality and success of the BSEA’s dispute resolution activities. Also, Massachusetts continues to report a rate of resolution session agreements that is significantly above the national agreement rate for the previous two reporting years (23.5% and 30.3%), respectively.

The data reported here do not reflect the total number of settlement agreements reached by parties who filed due process complaints in this period. Settlement agreements reached outside of the resolution meeting, including any agreements reached in cases initiated by the school district, are not included in Indicator 18. Resolution meetings were held in only 8 percent of due process complaints, but more than 75% of the 582 due process complaints filed were withdrawn or dismissed prior to hearing. Indicator 18 does not account for resolution of these cases.

Improvement Activities

Consistent with instructions from OSERS, MASSDE is reporting one set of improvement activities in Appendix A of this report. Each activity references the relevant indicators, and is also listed in the MA SPP for those indicators.

MASSDE would like to highlight the Facilitated IEP Team Meeting (FIEP) activities from 2011-2012 that have supported early dispute resolution and conflict management in the Commonwealth. In the FIEP
process, the BSEA offers facilitators, available at no cost to the parties, to help with difficult IEP Team meetings. Although either party may request a facilitator for the IEP Team meeting, both parties must agree to accept the facilitator’s services. The trained, impartial facilitator, who is not part of the Team, is present at the meeting to assist Team members to develop and follow an agenda; stay focused on the goal of developing an acceptable IEP; resolve conflicts that arise during the meeting; and maintain open communication. This resource has been helpful in supporting parties in reaching agreement on the student’s IEP and related issues prior to, and in many cases in lieu of, filing a request for a due process hearing.

The BSEA has offered stakeholders this FIEP option for six years, with usage increasing each year since its inception. This past year saw an almost 11% increase in the number of FIEPs held. Also, during 2011-2012, the BSEA commissioned a study on the effectiveness of FIEPS to determine if the program was regarded as valuable by the users. Results reflected that the process is well received by parents and school districts alike.

Facilitators for IEP Team meetings are commonly requested when the relationship between the school district and the parents is strained or adversarial, when there is a history of disruptiveness at meetings, or when an IEP Team meeting is expected to be contentious due the complexity of the issues being discussed or some underlying controversy. Therefore, successful conflict resolution at this early stage in the process could result in the filing of fewer hearing requests and fewer resolution sessions.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):**

The MA SPP for Indicator 18 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: 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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>77% - 87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediations held</th>
<th>Mediation agreements related to due process complaints</th>
<th>Mediation agreements not related to due process</th>
<th>Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BSEA reported through the IDEA Part B – Dispute Resolution, School Year: 2011-2012 Table (see Appendix D) that 853 mediations were held during the reporting period. Of those, 729 or 85.5%, resulted in mediation agreements. This rate is within the target range, is consistent with previous years’ data, and is comparable to national mediation success rate data.

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 13-6, Massachusetts is not required to report on slippage or improvement activities for Indicator 19 for FFY2011 because the State met its measurable and rigorous target.

Please note that the FFY2010 MA APR included an error in the actual target data and calculation for Indicator 19. Mediation agreements related to due process complaints were reached in 37 cases, and not 46 as originally reported. The adjusted percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements is 86.2%, approximately one percentage point lower than the reported rate. The results for FFY2010 were still within the state-established measurable and rigorous target range.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 19 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: 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 (first Wednesday in February for child count, including race and ethnicity; and educational environments; first Wednesday in November for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; December 15 for assessment; May 1 for Maintenance of Effort & Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports).

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>2011 (2011-2012)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Target Data for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 13-6 and the Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part B Indicator Measurement Table, MASSDE is not required to report data for Indicator 20 for the initial FFY2011 APR submission on February 1, 2013. OSEP will use the Indicator 20 Rubric to calculate Massachusetts' data for this indicator. MASSDE will have an opportunity to review and respond to OSEP's calculation of Massachusetts' data on this indicator. MASSDE has included in this clarification report a copy of the Indicator 20 Data Rubric created by OSEP, updated to include corrections based on data and information included in this report. (See Appendix E.)

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Slippage, if the State did not meet its target, that occurred for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

Discussion of improvement activities and explanation of slippage, if Massachusetts did not meet its target, will be included after the OSEP calculation has been reviewed.

MASSDE continues to take steps to ensure compliance with the requirements of accurate and timely data reporting, including ensuring error-free consistent, valid and reliable data. These efforts begin with providing support to school districts for statewide data collection activities. Each school district is assigned a data collection support specialist within MASSDE to facilitate data collection activities and to address questions as they arise. The specialists also provide school districts with technical assistance and guidance on data collection practices and timelines to facilitate accurate and timely reporting of valid and reliable data. Other resources, including data reporting schedules and technical assistance resources, are made available on the agency's website at http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/data/schedule.html. These resources and schedules, and other reporting guidelines, are reviewed and updated frequently. MASSDE’s efforts to provide this direct support to school districts help to ensure that Massachusetts is able to meet federal data reporting requirements.
Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY2011 (2011-2012):

The MA SPP for Indicator 20 includes new or revised improvement activities, timelines, and resources to reflect new initiatives or to update existing initiatives.
APPENDIX A: Cross-Cutting Improvement Activities, FFY2005-2012
with Special Focus on FFY2011

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) enacted on May 3, 2010, 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.

The law included special provisions focused on students with disabilities who the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Team determined to be at risk for bullying on the basis of the students’ disability. MASSDSE provided best practice guidance to school districts on 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 school year 2011-2012.

The Model Bullying Prevention and Intervention Plan, Guidelines for the Implementation of Social and Emotional Learning Curricula K-12, and other technical assistance documents, are available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/bullying/. This information is updated regularly.

ARRA Entitlement Grants

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

In 2009-2010, 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 were continuation activities from the first year of ARRA. Examples included:

- 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

**Indicators:** 1, 2, 4, 14 – FFY2008-2011

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

The grantees included a variety of educational settings: alternative programs and schools, vocational-technical high schools, comprehensive high schools, and education collaboratives. Grantees 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). Grantees were required to spend at least 25% of the funds on professional development. Professional development strategies reflected a wide range of approaches in terms of the amount of training provided, topics covered, methodology, and provider expertise.


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

**Indicators:** 1, 2, 4, 5, 13, 14 – FFY2007-2010

This grant program was designed to support the partnership of select school districts in Worcester County with the Central Massachusetts Communities of Care Project (CMCC) to develop and implement Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems (PBIS), a tiered system for improving school climate by supporting positive behaviors throughout the school. Participating schools received 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 were to: (1) 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 (2) increase participating schools’ ability to identify students, grades 4-8, in need of mental health services, and respond to the need for intensive support through internal capacity and community-based mental health providers.

By identifying at-risk students in need of mental health services and providing them with such service, partnerships worked to reduce and/or prevent court involvement among students with emotional impairments. Participating districts receive professional development and onsite assistance in developing and implementing the principles of PBIS. The training also focused on ensuring sustainable implementation and long-term success of this initiative in the participating schools.


### Closing the Achievement Gap Legislation

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

On January 18, 2010, Massachusetts enacted *An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap*, Chapter 12 of the Acts of 2012, comprehensive education reform legislation, which, among other things, required MADE to intervene in underperforming (Level 4) schools. The schools identified are targeted for aggressive interventions by MADE and its partners that are 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 – FFY2009-2010**

The purpose of this competitive grant opportunity was 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**

Through a three-year collaboration between urban mathematics and special educators from across the state, a set of leadership team protocols were developed that focus on students with disabilities when planning mathematics instruction. These protocols guide leadership teams, consisting of district and school administrators and teacher-leaders, building collaboration, promoting an understanding of both mathematics and the variability of learners, and modeling rigorous core instruction in mathematics (Tier 1) using multiple accessibility strategies. The five protocols explore the following topics:

- Shared Beliefs about Mathematics Instruction for Students with Disabilities;
- Essential Understandings About Students with Disabilities;
- Essential Understandings About Rigorous Mathematics Instruction;
- Aligning Barriers and Strategies; and
- Using an Accessibility Framework to Support a Group of Students.

These protocols were presented to the field at MASSDE’s FFY2011 Curriculum and Instruction Summit. In addition, MASSDE supported the 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 the Federation for Children with Special Needs

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

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. In addition, the APPLE (Advancing Parent-Professional Leadership in Education) Institute provides leadership training for district teams of PAC members and special education administrators. FCSN 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.

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. Also, FCSN
MassPAC at FCSN 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 FCSN 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. Responsibilities of this council 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.

Information about the SAC is available at: http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/sped/default.html.

**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);
- provide input about state established targets for SPP indicators;
- 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 goal of the Community/ Residential Education Project, which developed through an interagency agreement between MASSDE and the Massachusetts Department of Developmental Services (MDDS), 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 families’ capacity to care for their eligible children 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 a 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 Development Office (SEPP) instituted a series of training activities to supplement ongoing personnel development efforts.
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:
   - The Massachusetts IEP Process
   - A Principal's Role and Special Education in Massachusetts
   - Is Special Education the Right Service?
   - Transition From Adolescence Into Adulthood in Massachusetts
   - The Massachusetts Transition Planning Chart and Effective Transition Planning
   - 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.

During FFY2011, the CSPD training module *The Transition Planning Process Massachusetts* was amended to include revised tools and related activities to reflect current best practices in secondary transition. More information about the CSPD Training Project is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/sped/default.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/sped/default.html).

### Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Summit

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 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.

A major focus of the Summit held in November 2012 was on implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks across disciplines. Attendees previewed model curriculum units (MCUs) currently in piloting and development. Race To The Top (RTTT) districts have begun piloting 32 model units; another 60 are currently in development. In our initial RTTT application, ESE committed to creating 100 units, aligned to the. Ultimately, all model units aligned with the frameworks in English language arts, mathematics, history and social sciences, and science will be available to every district across the Commonwealth beginning in 2014. Four prototype units are available for review and use at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/).

### Data Collection and Analysis Activities – Review and Revision

*All Indicators - FFY2005-2012*

Since the beginning of the SPP period, MASSDE has annually in reviewed and revised, as appropriate, its data collection tools, and created technical assistance tools and resources for use by school districts participating in annual data collection activities. Information relevant to data collection and analysis activities for specific indicators is described in the APRs.

### District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) – MASSDE Center for School & District Accountability

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

In FFY2009, MASSDE opened six regionally based District and School Accountability Centers (DSACs) to help identified districts and their schools use professional development and targeted assistance to improve
instruction and raise achievement for all students. DSACs, which are part of MASSDE’s State System of Support, 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.

More information about the DSAC Teams and the districts they serve is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/support/teams.html.

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 Dropout Prevention and Recovery Workgroup, supported by both the Urban and Commissioner’s Districts unit and the Secondary Support Services unit of MASSDE, 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. The Workgroup focuses on facilitating the sharing of promising practices among districts, and supporting districts’ team activities through face-to-face meetings and webinars. Participating school districts host the meetings, which usually include a short, formal presentation of the host district’s initiatives and opportunities to observe the activities described, brainstorm ideas and resources, and provide support and technical assistance to each other. The awarding of the High School Graduation Initiative in 2010 (see description below) allowed MASSDE the opportunity to expand the Workgroup to include the 133 targeted high schools. The variety and frequency of opportunities for networking and sharing of promising practices increased and included the addition of a monthly e-newsletter.

More information about the Workgroup’s activities is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/massgrad/workgroup.html.

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

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

In the fall of 2011, MASSDE created the College and Career Readiness Unit which now houses all Dropout Prevention, Intervention and Recovery activities along with other high school graduation initiatives. Information specific to Dropout Prevention, Intervention and Recovery can be found at the website, http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/. An extensive collection of dropout reduction related articles/reports, dropout data overview information, and descriptions of the myriad state activities related to reducing dropout rates and improving graduation rates can be found at this website. 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 FFY 2011, MASSDE, in partnership with the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (MEEC), provided the following professional development opportunities for public preschool and kindergarten staff and other early childhood professionals working in programs that serve young students with disabilities:

- **Strengthening Families Approach to Working with Students with Disabilities** - Five, one-day sessions offered to communities of practice across Massachusetts that included individuals from public schools, early intervention programs, and early education and care programs. Sessions addressed ways to include the Strengthening Families Protective Factors approach in everyday practice.
- **Social Emotional Management for Children on the Autism Spectrum** - Four, four-day sessions offered throughout the year including an introduction to Autism Spectrum Disorder and how to individualize the curriculum, communication, and environment for these students in an inclusive early childhood setting.
- **Brain Building and Early Literacy and Numeracy: Strategies and Supports for Young Children (Birth to 8) Conference** - Three, 1-day sessions that served as a kick-off for new early literacy professional learning communities (PLC) across the state. Participants in PLCs committed to attend meetings, webinars, and peer-to-peer site visits from October, 2011 through June, 2012. Members included...
instructional leaders from early education and care programs serving children from birth through age 8, including community based programs, family child care, public school districts, and Head Start.

- **Peers in the Inclusive Classroom – A Dialogue on Programming** - Five, one-day sessions on how to use assessments and screenings to inform individualized instruction for children. Participants were members of the early literacy professional learning communities.

- **Communities of Practice Meetings** - Over 250 people attended one of five regional meetings across the state that provided an overview of Dr. Brazelton’s Touchpoints model of development.

- **Early Childhood Special Education – Embedding Early Childhood Outcomes into Practice Using the SpecialQuest Approach** - This one-day training focused on the outcomes reported under Indicator 7.

- **Early Childhood Special Education Transition Professional Development** - Four one-day trainings were held across Massachusetts for 120 participants from early intervention programs and public school districts. The trainings included an overview of the state performance plan and annual performance report, the new IDEA Part C regulations, and provided participants to discuss coordination of local transition practices and protocols to support timely implementation of transition planning activities. These trainings will be offered again in FFY2012.

- **Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) Training Sessions** - This training provided guidance in how to use the CLASS to incorporate professional development supports that enable teachers to improve outcomes for young students. It was offered in collaboration with The Center for Assessment and Screening Excellence (CASE).

- **Public Preschool Site Visits** - From January through June, 2012 Early Education and Care (EEC) Family Community Quality Specialists and Department of Public Health (DPH) Regional Consultation Program Specialists visited the early childhood special education programs in 230 public school districts. On these visits staff members provided guidance on technical assistance opportunities that are available to LEAs for the implementation of activities related to Indicators 6, 7, and 12.

**Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII) and Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS)**

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

Using a statistical regression model, in 2008 MASSDE developed the Early Warning Indicator Index (EWII), 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.

In October of 2012 MASSDE presented The Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS) to replace the EWII. This is a comprehensive, data-driven system designed to identify students kindergarten through high school that are potentially "off-track" for grade-level or developmental age, including those students that are off-track for high school graduation (potential dropouts). This project is funded through the federal Longitudinal Data System Grant Program (LDS) and is part of a larger effort to develop an integrated suite of tools for Massachusetts educators. Future iterations of the model hope to expand its scope and include children from birth through college. The American Institutes for Research (AIR) is the contracted research group developing and validating the EWIS statistical model for the Commonwealth.

Information about EWIS is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html).
Educational Proficiency Plans (EPPs) – MASSDE Student Support and Secondary School Services Unit

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

An Educational Proficiency Plan (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 their strengths and weaknesses in the learning environment as the EPP is developed.

More information about EPPs is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/epp/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/epp/).

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 U.S. Department of Education 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 of 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.

More information about these school turnaround grants is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/grants/default.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/grants/default.html).
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.

A copy of this report is available at http://www.mass.gov/edu/dropout-report.html.

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.

A summary of 2011-2012 activities related to this grant program is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/2012-06 ConcurrentEnrollment.pdf.

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), 21st Century Community Learning Center (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, ESE 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. Funds are used to stipend specially trained instructional staff, stipend health care, instructional assistants and/or other support staff, support additional planning time, and provide professional development, technical assistance and/or consultation services(e.g. proper use of adaptive equipment, language of instruction for students with disabilities, creating an inclusive environment, etc.).

Thirteen sites offered pilot programs in 2010-2011. Based on their success, the SPED Enhancement Grant opportunity continues to be offered to CCLC sites. In FFY2011, these grant funds provided inclusive and enhanced services at 45 different schools across the Commonwealth for more than 2900 students on IEPs.

Current information about this grant program is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/21cclc/.
Massachusetts FOCUS Academy (MFA)

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

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.

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. The 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. MFA courses offered in 2011-2012 included:

- 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, was offered this year. The course is designed to prepare educators 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. Candidates were invited to participate in the course based on their completion of all of the courses offered in one of the content areas, and a recommendation from the course instructor(s).

More information about current MFA offerings is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mfa/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mfa/).

During FFY2011, MASSDE also worked with partners to develop the following courses that will be piloted in FFY2012:

- (UDL): Affect and Engagement to Improve Learning
- How to Partner with Families of Preschool and Elementary School Students with Disabilities
- Secondary Transition Assessment for Students with Disabilities.

Massachusetts High School Graduation Initiative (MassGrad)

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

In fall 2010, the U.S. Department of Education selected Massachusetts as just one of two states and one of 29 projects out of 184 total applicants to receive funding through federal High School Graduation Initiative award. The purpose of the award is to support statewide and local efforts for high school dropout prevention, intervention, and recovery. The focus is on the high schools (MassGrad cohort) that exceeded the statewide annual dropout rate of 2.9% in school year 2008-2009.

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 through face-to-face gatherings as well as webinars and an e-newsletter. 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:** through a competitive grant process, MASSDE will help support targeted schools in implementing a select menu of research and evidence-based practices and strategies through 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.

More information about MassGrad activities is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/massgrad/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/massgrad/).

### Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA)

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

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 goals of having qualified educators for every public school classroom as a means of improving student outcomes and reducing the achievement gaps. The Massachusetts Licensure Academy (MLA) was created to meet the significant shortage of educators who are qualified to teach these student populations. MLA courses 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); and
- a course designed to create and maintain positive learning environments for all students (1 course).

The first courses, taught in FFY2011 were:

- *Federal and State Laws, Educational Terminology and the Role of Other Agencies Pertaining to the Education of Students with IEPs and*
- *Assessment for Determination of Education Needs, Curriculum, Services and Programs, Including Augmentative and Alternative Communication and Other Assistive Technologies*

Additional courses are presently being developed in the content areas. More information about current MFA offerings is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mla/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mla/).

### 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](http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0811behavioralhealth.pdf) 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 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

**Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Conference**

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14 – FFY2011*

MASSDE hosted a conference on the Massachusetts Tiered System of Support in March 2012 for teams of District and School leaders throughout the Commonwealth. Topics included:

- Tiered System of Support: Linking Academic and Behavior Supports
- The new learning sciences: How variability in learning informs teaching in the 21st century
- School-wide Positive Behavior Supports: Tiered System of Support-Non-academic
- Working memory: From concept to classroom
- Tiered instruction with Mathematics, K- Algebra
- Challenging every learner: Approaches to mediating difficult text during Tier 1 Instruction, K – 8

Districts with teams of educators attending the MTSS conference were eligible to apply for an MTSS grant to support the development of their action plans focused on establishing, enhancing, and aligning an academic and non-academic tiered system of support.

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

*Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 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 MTSS grants is to support the development of district and school strategic action plans focused on establishing, enhancing, and aligning an academic and non-academic tiered system of support.

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

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

MASSDE provides the districts and all educators in the Commonwealth with the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Professional Development Series. NASDSE facilitates this series with support from the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN). These conferences bring nationally recognized experts to the states using technology, providing an affordable and accessible 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:

- It’s 2012 – Do You Know Where Your RTI Is?
- Section 504 Issues for Students with Disabilities: Case Law and Implications for Practice
- Providing Education Assessment Appropriate for Every Student: Is It Possible?
- We’re Better Working Together: Recommendations for Improved Coordination Between Title 1 and the IDEA

The most current information about this series is available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/2012/nasdse.html.

Massachusetts Work-Based Learning Plan (WBLP) – MASSDE Student Support, Career & Education Services

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

The Massachusetts Work-Based Learning Plan (WBLP) 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. More information is available at http://www.skillslibrary.com/wbl.htm.

Beginning in March 2009, SEPP collaborated with the MASSDE Connecting Activities Office (see http://www.doe.mass.edu/connect/) to develop a guidance document called Using the Massachusetts Work-Based Learning Plan in Transition Planning Activities for Students with Disabilities (available at http://www.skillslibrary.com/wbl/wblp_transition.pdf) and to enhance the WBLP Scoring Rubric (see http://www.skillslibrary.com/wbl/WBLP_Rubric_Summer2009.pdf). 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 webpages, available at http://resources21.org/transitionworkexp/index.asp. This resource lists resources, including websites, articles, and program materials, to assist in planning the work experiences and developing WBLPs for students with disabilities.

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

Indicators 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12 – FFY2007-2010

The purpose of this three-year grant program was 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) 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. The teams brought 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) implemented two to three strategies that were 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.
### 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 is engaged in continuous review and revision of its procedures for verifying correction of noncompliance for the above-referenced indicators in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 from October 17, 2008. Verification activities have included:

1. If needed, changing, or requiring each district to change, policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance based on root cause analyses;
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;
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); and
4. Engaging in continuous improvement of state and local data collection systems, definitions, and technical assistance sources to ensure correct implementation of relevant regulatory requirements.

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 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).

### Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Fund Award

**Indicators 6, 7, 12 – FFY2011-2012**

In FFY2011, Massachusetts applied for and received a Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Fund award of $50 million for its proposal: *From Birth to School Readiness: Massachusetts Early Learning Plan, 2012-2015*. This initiative, coordinated by the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (MEEC), will advance goal of ensuring that all children, particularly high-needs children, have access to quality pre-K education.

Key strategies of the plan include:

- Aligning early education and grades K-3 to promote healthy child development
- Implementing standards for early learning and development, including English language development standards for children from birth to age 5.
- Creation of the Massachusetts Early Learning and Development Assessment System (MELD) for birth to grade three, including expanding screening for children and the development of a common tool for kindergarten entry assessment.
- Providing targeted technical assistance and professional development opportunities to early educators
to enhance their effectiveness.
- Increased engagement with parents, families, and community members that is culturally and linguistically appropriate.

A copy of Massachusetts’ successful application is available at http://www.eec.state.ma.us/docs1/board_materials/20111017-rttt-else.pdf.

### 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, 7, 11, 13 – FFY2008-2012**

The Ten Step Guide was revised by a comprehensive group of stakeholders and reissued as *The Guidelines for the Specialized Assessment of Students with Visual Impairments*. 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, collaborated to revise the “Ten Step Guide” to reflect updated regulatory information and include best practices. The revised *Guidelines* includes a new section describing the “hidden” characteristics of a vision loss that affect academic and social factors, detailed job descriptions for the various professionals that provide specialized services for students with visual impairments, and recommendations on gathering information from all team members to enhance decision-making.

The *Guidelines* also introduce the Expanded Core Curriculum (ECC), which is the body of knowledge and skills that are needed by students with visual impairments due to their unique disability-specific needs. The ECC should be used as a framework for assessing students, planning individual goals and providing instruction. Understanding these characteristics will enable non-vision specialists to facilitate meaningful inclusion and participation of students with visual impairments throughout the school day.

Among other things, the *Guidelines*:
- review types of assessments and provide sample assessment forms for an initial evaluation or three-year reevaluation to support the eligibility determination of special education services for students with visual impairments;
- help ensure a common understanding of the purpose and complexity of conducting specialized assessments of students with visual impairments;
- assist Teams in designing instruction and supports for students with visual impairments to ensure access to the general curriculum and life of the school; and
- provide resources to help general and special educators and related service providers meet the unique needs of students with visual impairments and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living.

Re-formatted for use as a web-based resources, the *Guidelines*, released in July 2012, are available at http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/vision-guidelines/.
Secondary School Reading Grant

Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14 – FFY2005-2011

The Massachusetts Middle and High School Reading Initiative project began in 2002 with the development of the Massachusetts Secondary Literacy Framework. This framework included 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 was 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 received 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 received small grants to implement one or more elements of their action plans. In addition to receiving a small grant, schools came 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) attended these meetings.

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. 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 led breakout sessions at each network meeting. These breakout sessions provided an opportunity for other project schools to learn about the promising practices that are being tried by other schools. At each meeting, school teams had a chance to meet with each other to reflect on the day's learning and to discuss implications for their schools.

Secondary Transition Strategic Planning

Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 – FFY2011-2012

In May 2012, staff from MASSDE’s special education and college/career readiness units attended NSTTAC’s Capacity Building Institute in Charlotte, NC, along with Massachusetts stakeholders from districts, higher education, the Parent Training and Information Center, and the advocacy community, for the purpose of developing a statewide strategic plan. As a result of this meeting, staff from MASSDE’s special education, college/career readiness, and career/vocational technical education offices continue to meet regularly with a widening group of stakeholders around secondary transition and will host a district/school capacity-building conference for 600 participants in April 2013. Other outcomes include the ongoing development of a visual model for secondary transition and the creation of a district/school secondary transition needs assessment.

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 – FFY2008-2011

Transition Works: Innovative Strategies for Transitioning Youth with Disabilities from School to Work, was a five-year grant from USED awarded to MRC to support transitioning youth with disabilities from school to work. The program focused on aligning existing services and developing innovative practices. As part of this initiative, vocational rehabilitation counselors partnered with local school districts to support youth with disabilities in their transitions from school to work, postsecondary education, and independent living. In addition, MRC and the Federation for Children with Special Needs wrote a parent guide to transition, and the Institute for Community Inclusion developed a new transition website, Youth on the Move, www.youth-move.org. MASSDE, the Federation for Children with Special Needs, Urban Pride, Commonwealth Corporation, and the Institute for Community Inclusion partnered with MRC to implement grant activities.

Additional information about this partnership is available at http://www.mass.gov/eohhs/consumer/family-services/youth-services/youth-with-disabilities/transition-works-grant.html.
### 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 encouraged districts to examine their own policies and procedures regarding special education eligibility and disability definitions.

### Review of Special Education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

**All Indicators – FFY 2011-2012**

Thomas Hehir and Associates was retained by MASSDE in the spring of 2011 to conduct a comprehensive review of special education in the Commonwealth. The research focused on issues of identification, placement, and performance in Massachusetts and yielded interesting and useful results, some of which are summarized below. The full report can be accessed on the following link: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/hehir/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/hehir/)

Dr. Hehir’s targeted recommendations focus on state activities intervening in districts that have overrepresentation of low-income students and/or over-use of substantially separate educational settings. He also suggests that the state assume a larger role in “promoting good practices that have been shown to benefit students with disabilities.” Specifically, the report suggests that the state and districts adopt the principles of Universal Design for Learning, universally designed behavior supports, and tiered systems of supports (e.g., MTSS) in order to accelerate the implementation of these interventions and to eventually reduce the large numbers of students identified for special education. MASSDE is actively working with districts in these areas.

### Sign Language Web-Based Resource Library

**Indicators 3, 5 – FFY2008-2012**

The Sign Language Video Resource Library 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 was to provide school districts with ongoing technical assistance and to prompt dialogue within, among, and between districts and MASSDE, organized around the SPP indicators.

### Special Education Leadership Academies and Seminars

**Indicators 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 – FFY2005-2012**

Beginning in FFY2005, as part of the Special Education Summer Institutes, MASSDE has annually provided two Special Education Leadership Academies. The academies provide school district special education administrators opportunities to improve current skills and develop new leadership skills. Academy I is open to administrators who have less than 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 also 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. in collaboration with the MASSDE/Career/Vocational Technical Education unit, designed and developed a Special Education Leadership Academy in FFY2011 that followed the design of the DSAC team-based leadership academy.


### 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 without cost 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. 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. Special Education Institutes offered in the Summer of 2012 included:

- Accessing Communication & Curriculum through Technology
- Assessing English Language Learners (ELL) With Disabilities
- Collaborative Evaluation Led By Local Educators
- Current Issues in School-Based Occupational Therapy & Physical Therapy
- Effective Evaluation of Special Education Programs
- 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
- Occupational Therapy & Physical Therapy in Educational Settings
- Paraprofessionals in Inclusive Settings
- Strategies for Students with Sensory Processing Disorders in Inclusive School Settings
- Emerging Technology for Students with Low Vision

Additional information about the Institutes listed above is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/institutes/12/sped.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/institutes/12/sped.html).

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

**Indicators 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 – FFY2005-2008, 2011-2012**

The purpose of this grant program is to fund professional development activities that will advance the knowledge, skills, and capacity of educators to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities and to promote inclusive practices across all settings through high-quality, job-embedded, and sustained professional development activities. Fund Code 274 was available to all public school districts, public charter schools and educational collaboratives. Almost every school district in the state utilizes these funds.

Grant priorities for FFY2011 were:

- Priority 1 - Curriculum and Instruction
- Priority 2 - Non-Academic Supports in Classrooms
- Priority 3 - Early Childhood Inclusive Practices
- **Priority 4 - Secondary Transition**

Additional information about current grant priorities is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants13/rfp/274.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants13/rfp/274.html).

### Special Education Program Improvement Grants (Fund Code 249)

**Indicators 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13 – FFY2005-2009, 2011-2012**

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. 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.

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 resumed in FFY2011. Priorities for FFY2011 were Educator Effectiveness, Content Skill Development, Non-Academic Supports, and Secondary Transition.

Additional information about current grant priorities is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants13/rfp/249.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants13/rfp/249.html).

### 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) and [http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/mtss/default.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/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. Information about these activities is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/tss/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/tss/).
## Universal Design for Learning Academy

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14 – FFY2011-2012**

MASSDE is collaborating with CAST to offer, in the 20120-2013 school year, year-long professional development and technical assistance to fifteen high-needs districts, chosen through a competitive RFP process, through The Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Academy. This academy supports the chosen districts' efforts to plan for and implement UDL as part of a tiered system of support. The goal of Academy is to establish a team of school and district leaders who will shape the learning environment so that it addresses the variability of ALL learners, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who have already demonstrated mastery of the concepts and skills being taught. The Academy is also designed to support collaboration between level 3 and 4 districts and their DSAC regional staff or Commissioner's District Liaisons by teaming district staff with their DSAC or ESE liaisons. The work of the academy has been designed to take the professional development offered in the summer to the implementation phase.

Academy activities include a series of one and two-day workshops that will deepen understanding of the UDL framework, apply UDL to lesson development, and dive deeper into content areas, including ELA and Math specifically. CAST will also provide on-going support for diving deeper into content areas; this will be delivered face-to-face and/or online by means of courses, webinars, and discussion groups. Over the course of the academy, leadership teams will gain the knowledge, skills and resources necessary to apply UDL at the classroom, school, and district levels. Teams will work to embed the principles of UDL into district and school level systems, classroom level instruction, and curriculum and assessment. Additional information about the UDL Academy is available at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants13/rfp/324.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/grants/grants13/rfp/324.html).

## Universal Design for Learning Summer Training Series

**Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14 – FFY2011-2012**

In the summer of 2012, in collaboration with CAST, MASSDE offered two 2-day institutes for teams of Massachusetts educators entitled, Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Addressing the Variability of All Learners. Thirty-five district teams were chosen through a competitive process to attend one of the summer institutes. During these institutes, educator teams tackled challenging questions, including: how to minimize learning barriers and maximize learning opportunities for all students, how to design lessons and curriculum units to address the wide range of learners in today's classrooms, and what steps needed to be taken to integrate UDL into their schools and districts.

As part of the UDL Summer Training Series, MASSDE also sponsored a team of 40 Massachusetts educators and ESE personnel to attend the Harvard Graduate School of Education's professional development institute, Universal Design for Learning: Reaching All Learners. This week-long training provided participants with a deep understanding of the UDL approach, which “considers the needs of the greatest number and range of possible learners and offers educational methods and materials that eliminate costly, cumbersome and after-the-fact adaptations.” The institute also fostered collaboration between experts in teaching, educational administration, policymaking, and technology, and provided “a blueprint for creating flexible goals, methods, materials and assessments that enable all students to succeed in the classroom.”
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE MASSACHUSETTS POSTSECONDARY TRANSITION PLANNING CHECKLIST FOR INDICATOR 13

IDEA 2004 and Massachusetts law require that transition planning occur for students aged 14-21 with IEPs. Federal law requires Massachusetts to collect data on Secondary Transition using Indicator 13. During this data collection, your district will use the Massachusetts Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist for Indicator 13 to analyze 30 student records that reasonably represent a cross-section of disabilities, ages, and special education placements for evidence of appropriate secondary transition planning. Please complete one checklist for each student being reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>The date will auto-populate on the day you complete the checklist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>Find the most recent complete Transition Planning Form (TPF) in the student’s file. If there is no TPF in the file, answer NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>Enter the date of the most recent complete TPF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3**
Examine the vision statement on the TPF and the IEP. Does each vision statement articulate what the student hopes to achieve after leaving secondary school? These desired outcomes, which should be phrased as postsecondary goals in the vision statement, should be measurable (i.e. countable) and should express the student’s future intentions in each of the areas of education/training, employment, and – if appropriate – independent living. Indicate YES or NO. See Massachusetts Postsecondary Transition Planning: Goals Example Sheet for examples of appropriate measurable postsecondary goals.

| Question 3a | □ If the answer to Question 3 is NO, please select NA. |
| □ If the answer to Question 3 is YES but this is the first TPF completed for the student at age 13 or 14, please select NA. |
| □ If the answer to Question 3 is YES and if the student’s postsecondary goals in the vision statement have been updated since the previous year’s TPF and IEP, please select YES. |

| Question 3b | □ If the answer to Question 3 is NO, please select NA. |
| □ If the answer to Question 3 is YES, examine available information such as the student’s file, teacher notes, and the student’s IEP, especially Student Strengths and Key Evaluation Results Summary (IEP1), Age-Specific Considerations (IEP3), and State or District-Wide Assessment (IEP7). If the student’s desired postsecondary outcomes in the vision statement have been based on age-appropriate transition assessments, please select YES. | Massachusetts Postsecondary Transition Planning: Transition Assessments Example Sheet for a list of possible transition assessments. |

| Question 4 | Examine the student’s IEP, including Service Delivery (IEP5) and Additional Information (IEP8). Also examine the student’s transcript and current schedule. The student’s services should include services reasonably calculated to enable the student to attain his/her postsecondary goals. Do the student’s transition services include services and courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate their movement from school to post-school life? Indicate YES or NO. See Massachusetts Postsecondary Transition Planning: Goals Example Sheet for a definition of “transition services.” |

| Question 5 | Examine the student’s IEP, especially Current Performance Levels/Measurable Annual Goals (IEP4). Does the student’s IEP include measurable (i.e. countable) annual (i.e. taking one year to accomplish) goals that address the student’s disability-related needs in the area of transition? There should be a clear relationship between the desired outcomes in the vision statement and the skill-based IEP goals necessary to assist the student to attain that vision. Indicate YES or NO. For examples of measurable annual skill-based IEP goals, see Massachusetts Postsecondary Transition Planning: Goals Example Sheet. |

| Question 6 | Is there evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting? Note that this question does not ask if the student actually attended the IEP meeting; a student might not attend for many reasons. If the student was invited, please answer YES. |

| Question 7 | □ If it is too early to determine if the student will need outside agency involvement, please answer NA. |
| □ If parent or student did not give prior consent to invite an agency, please answer NA. |
| □ If it was not appropriate to invite a representative of an agency to attend the IEP team meeting, please answer NO. |
| □ If it was appropriate to invite a representative of an agency to the IEP team meeting, yet none was invited, please answer NO. |
| □ If a representative of an agency was invited to the IEP team meeting, please answer YES. Note that this question does not ask if the agency actually attended the IEP meeting; an agency might not attend for many reasons. |

**Notes**
Use this section to indicate any extenuating circumstances or other pertinent information. Please be specific.

**Typed Name**
Enter name of the person completing the Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist for Indicator 13. This person should understand the Transition process.

**Role**
Indicate the role of the person completing the Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist for Indicator 13.
### Massachusetts Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist for Indicator 13

**Student Name** ______________________  **SASID** ______________________  **Age** _____  **Primary Disability** _________________  **Level of Need** ___________

**District** ______________________  **LEA Code** ______________________  **Date** ___________

#### Transition Planning Form (28M/9)

1. Is there a completed Transition Planning Form (28M/9) in the student's file?  
   - Y  
   - N

2. Date form last completed: ______________________

#### Does the student's Vision Statement on the IEP and Transition Planning Form include:

3. Appropriate measurable postsecondary goal(s)?  
   - Y  
   - N

   3a. If there are appropriate measurable postsecondary goals, are these goals updated annually?  
      - Y  
      - N  
      - NA

   3b. If there are appropriate measurable postsecondary goals, are these goals based on age-appropriate transition assessment?  
      - Y  
      - N  
      - NA

#### Does the student's IEP include:

4. Transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet these postsecondary goals?  
   - Y  
   - N

5. Measurable annual skill-based IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs?  
   - Y  
   - N

#### Is there evidence that:

6. The student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed?  
   - Y  
   - N

7. If appropriate, was a representative of any participating agency invited to the IEP Team meeting, with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority?  
   - Y  
   - N  
   - NA

#### Notes

**Typed Name:** ______________________  **Role:** ______________________
**APPENDIX C: 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 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)</th>
<th>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 (7/1/10 to 6/30/11)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school or training program, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</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>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.</td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</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>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 - educational placements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> 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.</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other areas of noncompliance: Faculty, Staff and Administration</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other areas of noncompliance: Discipline</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of noncompliance: IEP implementation and evaluation</td>
<td>Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>110</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>56</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</td>
<td></td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (b) / (a) X 100 =</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Massachusetts

**IDEA Part B - Dispute Resolution**  
**School Year: 2011-12**

#### Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

1. **Total number of written, signed complaints filed.** 298  
   1.1 Complaints with reports issued. 212  
   1.1.a Reports with findings of noncompliance. 153  
   1.1.b Reports within timelines. 209  
   1.1.c Reports within extended timelines. 3  
   1.2 Complaints pending. 7  
   1.2.a Complaints pending a due process hearing. 7  
   1.3 Complaints withdrawn or dismissed. 79

#### Section B: Mediation Requests

2. **Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.** 1237  
   2.1 Mediations held. 853  
   2.1.a Mediations held related to due process complaints. 29  
   2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints. 25  
   2.1.b Mediations held not related to due process complaints. 824  
   2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints. 704  
   2.2 Mediations pending. 180  
   2.3 Mediations withdrawn or not held. 204
### Section C: Due Process Complaints

3. **Total number of due process complaints filed.** 582  
   3.1 Resolution meetings. 48  
   3.1.a Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings. 22  
   3.2 Hearings fully adjudicated. 18  
   3.2.a Decisions within timeline (include expedited). 1  
   3.2.b Decisions within extended timeline. 16  
   3.3 Due process complaints pending. 126  
   3.4 Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing). 438

### Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

4. **Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.** 21  
   4.1 Expedited resolution meetings. 1  
   4.1.a Expedited written settlement agreements. 1  
   4.2 Expedited hearings fully adjudicated. 0  
   4.2.a Change of placement ordered. 0  
   4.3 Expedited due process complaints pending. 4  
   4.4 Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed. 17

**Comment:**

**Additional Comment:**

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by Massachusetts. These data were generated on 10/26/2012.

EDFacts OMB Number: 1875 - 0240  
EDFacts Form Expires: 09/30/2013
### APPENDIX E – Indicator 20 Data Rubric, FFY2011

<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>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</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>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</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>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</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**: 32 38

#### APR Score Calculation

**Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2011 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.

**Grand Total** - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = 37.00 43.00
### 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: 2/1/12</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: 11/7/12</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: 2/1/12</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>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 11/7/12</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: 11/7/12</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: 12/19/12</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: 11/7/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8 – MOE/CEIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 5/1/12</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><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>618 Score Calculation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41.13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subtotal X 1.8695)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator #20 Calculation**

A. APR Grand Total  37.00 43.00

B. 618 Grand  41.13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (B) =</td>
<td><strong>78.13 84.13</strong></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>Base</td>
<td><strong>86.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td><strong>0.908 0.978</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td><strong>90.85 97.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 1.8695 for 618