Group 2 Priority:
Massachusetts State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator

Background
This grant has been developed to improve educator practice and outcomes for students with disabilities by generating professional development activities that are in alignment with state, district, school and/or educator goals and priorities, including educator evaluation.

The reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), signed on December 3, 2004, requires each state to have in place a State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). Through the SPP/APR, the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has identified indicators of performance and compliance to guide states and school districts in the implementation of IDEA. The SPP/APR indicators are one of the ways in which Massachusetts measures and reports state and district performance in meeting established targets focused on implementation of IDEA-Part B and improvement of positive educational outcomes for students with disabilities.

Description
With the articulated priority of Results-Driven Accountability by the Federal Office of Special Education Programs, professional development (PD) activities funded under this priority will improve effective implementation of the requirements and purposes of the IDEA - Part B and promote a continuous cycle of improvement by focusing on improvement strategies targeted to the priorities established in the Indicators identified by OSEP in the SPP/APR.

Districts and educational collaborations in Group 2 are directed to select one Indicator for the focus of FY2016 activities under Fund Code 274, and must ensure that the identified related activities leverage current improvement initiatives and are focused on improving successful outcomes for students with disabilities. All PD activities must be aligned with the selected Indicator and have clear goals and objectives relevant to desired educator and student outcomes. The Indicators, and suggested topics for each, are described below.

SPP/APR Indicator Focus Options

**Indicator 1: Graduation Rate**
This indicator measures the number of students with IEPs who graduate in four years or less, divided by the number of first-time entering 9th graders in that cohort.

**Indicator 2: Dropout Rate**
This indicator measures the dropout rate for students with IEPs in grades 9-12 in Massachusetts public schools who leave school prior to graduation for reasons other than to transfer to another school, and do not re-enroll before the following October 1.

**Indicator 3: Assessment**
This indicator measures the participation and performance rates of students with IEPs on statewide assessments.

**Indicator 4: Suspension and Expulsion**
This indicator measures whether a district has significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsion for greater than 10 days in a school year for students with IEPs, including significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity. If there is significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in a district, the district must review whether policies, procedures, or practices for IEP development and implementation, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards contribute to the significant discrepancy.

**Indicator 5: Educational Environments for Students Aged 6 - 21 with IEPs**
This indicator measures the percentage of students ages six through 21 with IEPs served in full inclusion, partial inclusion, substantially separate placements, and separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

**Indicator 6: Educational Environment for Students with IEPs (Ages 3 - 5)**
This indicator measures the percentage of children ages three through five with IEPs served in full inclusion, partial inclusion, substantially separate placements, and those receiving services in the home, through a service provider, in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.
**Indicator 7: Early Childhood Outcomes**
This indicator measures the percent of children with IEPs ages three through five 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.

**Indicator 8: Parent Involvement**
This indicator measures the percentage of parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means for improving services and results for students with disabilities.

**Indicator 9: Disproportionality in Special Education**
This indicator measures the percentage of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education, and includes a secondary analysis to determine whether disproportionality was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Indicator 10: Disproportionality in Specific Disability Categories**
This indicator measures the percentage of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, and includes a secondary analysis to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Indicator 11: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find**
In Massachusetts, this indicator measures the percentage of children who were evaluated within 30 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**
This indicator measures the percentage of students referred by Part C, found eligible for special education services, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthdays.

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**
In Massachusetts, Secondary Transition planning begins at age 14. Per IDEA, this indicator measures the percentage of students with IEPs, ages 16 and above, who have appropriate transition planning that is in compliance with requirements of federal special education law.

**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**
This indicator measures the percentage of students with IEPs who exited high school during a given school year and self-reported post-school engagement in education or employment one year after leaving high school.

**Topic Areas for Proposed PD**
Topics for evidence-based PD may include:
- Academic and/or Social/Emotional supports and interventions
- Assessment
- Career readiness (including but not limited to career awareness, career exploration, and career immersion)
- College readiness
- Creating positive learning environments – individual, classroom, school-wide, and/or district-wide
- Data-based decision making - individual, classroom, school-wide, and/or district-wide
- Dropout and truancy prevention
- Family engagement activities
- Inclusive education practices, including but not limited to embedding related services within the classroom
- Literacy
- Partnering with community-based organizations, institutions of higher education, and/or state agencies
- Progress monitoring
- Student self-advocacy and associated social skills, including but not limited to use of individual learning plans
- System-wide collaboration within a school district
- Tiered system of supports
- Wrap around services and supports
- Writing effective IEPs

**Examples of Possible Activities**
Activities for evidence-based PD (conducted before, during, and/or after school hours) may include, but are not limited to:
- Classes
• Conferences
• Courses
• PD consultative services
• Professional Learning Communities (PLC) or trainings with job embedded activities
• Workshops
• Other PD activities related to this priority

Note: 274 funds should not be expended solely for the creation of products such as handbooks, curricula, etc. These PD funds must be used for activities that clearly align with the Massachusetts Standards for High Quality Professional Development.

Demonstration of Proficiency
A requirement of high quality PD is that educators apply their learning and demonstrate subsequent proficiency in the relevant subject area. The proposal for PD activity(ies) funded under this grant program must include a description of the evaluation process that will be used, i.e., how the district will assess and measure the changes in educator knowledge, skills, and/or practices resulting from the proposed PD to ensure that it is meeting the targeted goals relevant to the desired student outcomes.

Educators may demonstrate proficiency in this priority area through means such as:
• Creation of protocols
• Assessments
• Observations
• Surveys
• Handbook development
• Improved data
• Curricula

In order to better disseminate promising practices statewide, ESE may request that districts share information about and outcomes resulting from this PD.

Training and Networking Opportunities
The ESE will offer districts the opportunity to attend one or more statewide training and networking meetings in 2015-2016 related to these priorities. These meetings may include opportunities for focused training and technical assistance, collaboration, and the sharing of best practices in this priority area and the others identified in the RFP. More information about these meetings will be announced in the fall of 2015.

OVERVIEW OF FUND CODE 274 NARRATIVE REQUIREMENTS
Professional Development Assurances Statement
A. Overview: Please select one of the following FY2016 priorities. All professional development (PD) in this application must align with the selected priority below.

1. Which priority will the proposed PD address?
2. Choose the topic(s) that best aligns with the proposed professional development.

B. Propose the activity(ies) to be funded through the 274 grant:

1. Identify and briefly describe the proposed PD activity(ies).
2. Identify the goal(s) and objective(s) for the proposed PD.

Note: Goal(s)/objective(s) must target improvement in educator practice and demonstrate a relationship to student outcomes. For the priority selected, the proposal must identify one SMART Goal for student learning outcomes and one for educator learning outcomes. If more than one activity is intended to be funded under this priority, outcomes must be aligned as described in the SMART Goals.

a. SMART Goal – Learning outcomes for students with disabilities
   (Smart Goal Definition: Specific and strategic; measurable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, results-focused; timed/tracked)
b. SMART Goal – Learning outcomes for Educators
   (Smart Goal Definition: Specific and strategic; measurable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, results-focused; timed/tracked)
c. Does the proposed PD support any state, district, school, and/or educator goals or priorities? Please Explain.
3. For each activity, provide a proposed timeline, including the number of contact hours and the name(s) of provider(s).

Note: If you are proposing individualized, rather than school or district-wide PD and have yet to identify a provider(s), please describe the type of provider you will be seeking and how you will ensure that the selected professional development will be aligned with the above priority and contribute to district professional development goals.

4. Describe the job embedded activities or plans for participants to apply their learning to the particular content and/or context.

5. Identify the professional role(s) of targeted participants
   - District Level Administrators
   - Special Education Teachers
   - Principals
   - Parents
   - Teachers
   - Paraprofessionals
   - Related Service Providers
   - Other____________________

C. Data-based Rationale for PD Activities:

1. What data did you analyze that led you to this proposed PD?
   - IDEA Part B State Performance Indicator Data
   - IDEA Part B Determination Level Data
   - Performance Data
   - MCAS Results
   - Teacher Surveys
   - Conditions for School Effectiveness Data
   - School Safety Discipline Report
   - Other____________________

2. Based on the data you analyzed, what is the rationale for the proposed PD?

D. Outcomes and Evaluation: How will you assess and measure the changes in educator knowledge, skills, and/or practices resulting from the proposed PD to ensure that it is meeting the targeted goals relevant to the desired student outcomes?