

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY18**



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

MA DESE is pleased to make available the Massachusetts IDEA Part B FFY 2018 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (MA SPP/APR). Throughout the Indicator reporting, MA DESE has set high targets, many of them aspirational in order to reflect our Commonwealth's commitment to high performance expectations for our students with disabilities and the communities in which they live and go to school. MA DESE welcomes suggestions, feedback, and other public comment.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

406

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

MA DESE has an integrated system of general supervision reflective of the eight key components of general supervision:

- State Performance Plan;
- Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation;
- Integrated Monitoring Activities;
- Fiscal Management;
- Data on Processes and Results;
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions;
- Effective Dispute Resolution; and
- Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development

See attached file for detail. File name: MA.SPP.FFY18.Intro

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

MA DESE has comprehensive systems of targeted technical assistance (TA) and professional development (PD) that are tied directly to local and statewide needs identified through the SPP/APR data collection and review processes and through the state's accountability system.

The MA DESE provides a coordinated set of guidance documents, technical assistance, and support to LEAs working to improve results for students with IEPs. This work is done within all programmatic offices at MA DESE, and in collaboration with other state agencies and national technical assistance and support centers.

Central to this work is the State's newly designed framework for district accountability and assistance: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/>. The new framework creates a coherent structure for linking the state's accountability and assistance activities with LEAs based on their level of need, and provides school and LEA leaders with common indicators and tools for assessing systems and practices, diagnosing challenges, and identifying appropriate interventions.

Under the new system, Massachusetts discontinued its former use of accountability and assistance levels 1-5 and replaced them with accountability categories that define the progress that schools and LEAs are making and the type of support they may receive from MA DESE. LEAs are now classified based on LEA-level data rather than the performance of the LEA's lowest performing school. As noted above, the State's process for making special education determinations was also revised and aligns with the new accountability system.

MA DESE uses special education determinations, SPP/APR indicator data, compliance data, and other achievement data to tailor technical assistance (TA) specifically to the needs of LEAs. Conversely, LEAs can and are encouraged to analyze local level data and make requests for technical assistance based on their analyses. Some examples of TA available to all LEAs include Technical Assistance Advisories; Frequently Asked Question (FAQs); webinars on selected special education topics; MA DESE-facilitated Regional Meetings for Special Education Directors and their staff; and compliance monitoring. For targeted LEAs, MA DESE has designed a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) to address specific needs and/or deficits in special education topic areas. Finally, for LEAs with specific issues or compliance problems, MA DESE provides direct, one-on-one TA to address the problems and create action plans for improvement. Technical assistance is provided in collaboration with national TA centers, including the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), the Positive Behavioral Interventions & Support Technical Assistance Center, the Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning, and WestEd's National Center for Systemic Improvement.

The Statewide System of Support (SSoS) also provides assistance and facilitates improvement planning in schools and districts identified by the accountability system. This includes districts and schools demonstrating performance gaps for students with disabilities. SSoS staff provide direct support in the field for planning and connections to existing resources. Additionally, SSoS convenes educators from across districts to learn from each other in networks, including related to inclusive practices.

Further information regarding MA DESE's general accountability and support system can be found here:

<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/>. Additional information specific to special education technical assistance, guidance and policy can be found here: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/ta.html>.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Educator Preparation

A core strategy in MA DESE's Strategic Plan is to promote educator development. By improving the depth and quality of preparation for new teachers, MA DESE intends to narrow the impact gaps between new and experienced teachers, improve retention rates for LEAs, and improve student outcomes,

particularly for our most vulnerable and underserved populations — inclusive of low-income students, English learners, students of color, and students with disabilities.

This objective includes improving the licensure system and supporting and evaluating educator preparation providers. MA DESE continues to streamline and improve processes for state licensure requirements. MA DESE also maintains and updates the Subject-Matter Knowledge Requirements (SMKs) (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/resources/smk-guidelines.pdf>) that define what content educators should know in each license field and that align to the curriculum standards for students outlined in the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Massachusetts licensure tests (MTEL) are based on SMKs and the Frameworks, and educator preparation programs rely on SMKs to guide their programming. Based on 2018 and 2019 updates to the SMK Guidelines, both the MTEs and teacher preparation programs are undergoing significant updates to align the assessments and programming to the SMKs.

Furthermore, MA DESE reviews the quality of programs offered by educator preparation providers. Over multi-year cycles, MA DESE, together with trained evaluators, reviews sponsoring organizations (including higher education institutions, non-profits, and LEAs) and examine a range of educator preparation program data, including survey data collected from a range of program stakeholders. MA DESE also provides organizations with formative feedback based on data on the performance of the candidates they prepare, and shares data tools with educator preparation providers to improve the educational experience of candidates.

MA DESE is committed to building the cultural responsiveness and diversity of our educator workforce (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/crdw/>). We have committed significant resources to support this work. In addition to the efforts and resources to diversify our workforce, we have built out tools to support building the cultural responsiveness of current educators practicing in our K-12 schools and districts.

MA DESE is working to offer resources and professional learning opportunities to enhance educator effectiveness for early-career educators, including resources for pre-service candidates and resources for in-service educators. For example, at the pre-service stage, to complete educator preparation, candidates must demonstrate skills and dispositions reflective of high-quality teaching through the Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/cap/>). MA DESE highlights effective practices for Induction and Mentoring based on an annual statewide survey of local education agencies.

Finally, MA DESE has invested in supporting LEAs to implement the Educator Evaluation Framework to provide all teachers and administrators, including new and experienced educators, with meaningful feedback to continuously improve their practice. MA DESE has recently updated resources to support effective implementation of the Model System. Most recently, MA DESE has developed and released a professional development tool, OPTIC, that supports Massachusetts educators to refine a shared understanding of effective, standards-aligned instructional practice and high quality feedback.

Educator Professional Development

MA DESE continues to dedicate resources to helping all educators improve their practice through participation in High Quality Professional Development (HQPD) (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/default.html>). MA DESE defines HQPD as a set of coherent learning experiences that is systematic, purposeful, and structured over a sustained period of time with the goal of improving teacher practice and student outcomes. HQPD enables educators to facilitate the learning of students by acquiring and applying knowledge, skills, and abilities that address student needs and improvement goals of the LEA, school, and individual. HQPD conforms to best practices in research, relates to educators' assignments and professional responsibilities, and aligns to the ten Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development:

1. HQPD has clear goals and objectives relevant to desired student outcomes.
2. HQPD aligns with state, district, school, and/or educator goals or priorities.
3. HQPD is designed based on the analysis of data relevant to the identified goals, objectives, and audience.
4. HQPD is assessed to ensure that it is meeting the targeted goals and objectives.
5. HQPD promotes collaboration among educators to encourage sharing of ideas and working together to achieve the identified goals and objectives.
6. HQPD advances an educator's ability to apply learnings from the professional development to his/her particular content and/or context.
7. HQPD models good pedagogical practice and applies knowledge of adult learning theory to engage educators.
8. HQPD makes use of relevant resources to ensure that the identified goals and objectives are met.
9. HQPD is taught or facilitated by a professional who is knowledgeable about the identified objectives.
10. HQPD sessions connect and build upon each other to provide a coherent and useful learning experience for educators.

All professional development offered by MA DESE and providers approved by the agency to award Professional Development Points (PDPs) must align with the HQPD standards. Through the HQPD registration and approval process, MA DESE assesses the evidence providers submit to demonstrate alignment with the MA Standards for Professional Development for the grade span and specific content area covered by the professional development. MA DESE delivers a wide variety of free HQPD, as exemplified in the 2019-20 Center for Instructional Support Program Catalog (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/instruction/networks.docx>).

MA DESE also supports a HQPD website. This website provides consistent, reliable access to: HQPD Case Studies guidelines and tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/leaders.html>) for educators to use when pursuing professional development; guidelines and HQPD Registry for providers; and resources and tools for local professional development leaders, including connecting HQPD to educator evaluation.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

Annually, MA DESE makes available the information contained in the state's SPP/APR for review and discussion in a variety of inter- and intra-agency meetings and forums, as well as in communications with external stakeholders and interested parties. This information is the basis for reflection and planning, and provides a longitudinal look at statewide performance in various areas.

MA DESE has publicly posted a complete copy of the State's FFY17 SPP/APR, and all previously submitted SPP/APRs, as well as OSEP's response to the state's submissions, on its website at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/maspp.html>.

MA DESE also publicly reports annually on LEA results on performance and compliance indicators. Data from FFY17 and for the preceding ten years may be viewed through LEA and school level reports on MA DESE's website, including the SPP targets for each SPP Indicator: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/gis/sped_map.aspx?orgcode=04450000&fycode=2018. FFY18 data will be posted at this location in the Winter/Spring of 2020 when all data reports are available.

In response to OSEP's required action in the FFY16 SPP/APR, MA DESE is demonstrating in this SPP/APR that it has publicly reported on the performance of each LEA located in the state in meeting the state targets for each SPP/APR Indicator for FFY17: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/gis/sped_map.aspx?orgcode=04450000&fycode=2018. Reports may be selected by LEA or school using the alphabetical drop down menu on the top right of the webpage.

In accordance with 34 CFR § 300.160(d), MA DESE publicly reports data on the participation of students with IEPs in statewide assessments at the state, LEA and school levels. State level information is available on the assessment participation webpage: <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/participation.aspx>. Please copy the link to the browser to access the statewide reports. LEA-level information on the participation of students with IEPs in statewide assessments, with and without accommodations and including students who participate in the MCAS-Alt, may be accessed from the state-level page referenced above by clicking on the LEA name. An example of an LEA-level report is provided here: <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/participation.aspx?orgtypecode=5&linkid=26&fycode=2019&orgcode=04450000>. Reports are selected by school year using the arrow button at the top left of the web page.

MA DESE publicly reports performance results for students with IEPs who take the MCAS-Alt in a separate state level report found here: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/mcas_alt.aspx. Reports may be selected by type (district/school), school year and subject by using the drop down menu at the top of the page. LEA-level information on MCAS-Alt performance results may be accessed from the state level page referenced above by clicking on the name of the LEA. An example of an LEA level report is provided here: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/mcas/achievement_alt_level.aspx?linkid=116&orgcode=06000000&orgtypecode=5&fycode=2019. Reports are selected by school year using the arrow button at the top left of the web page.

At the instruction of OSEP during the FFY16 clarification period, MA DESE updated its public reporting systems to ensure that it makes available assessment data for students with disabilities with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of students without disabilities, consistent with 34 CFR 300.160(f). This information is now integrated into the assessment webpages referenced above at: <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/participation.aspx> and http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/mcas_alt.aspx

MA DESE reports accountability data at the LEA and school levels: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/>.

MA DESE also makes available information about progress, slippage, and related requirements through meetings with stakeholders and professional organizations, and through regional and statewide interest groups, some of which are facilitated by partner agencies and organizations.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

The State will include FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) report to be filed with the U.S. Department of Education on or before April 1, 2020. As requested, this report will include relevant data and explanation of the activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; implemented and achieved measures and outcomes; a detailed summary of the coherent improvement strategies executed as part of the SSIP; and other relevant data and information to assess the State's capacity to improve SiMR data. MA DESE is currently preparing this report for timely submission.

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	65.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%
Data	67.80%	69.10%	69.90%	71.79%	72.83%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	72.36%	73.36%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	10,543
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	14,571
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	72.36%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10,543	14,571	72.83%	72.36%	72.36%	Met Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

To receive a diploma from a public high school in Massachusetts, a student must:

- 1) earn a Competency Determination (CD), which means achieving a specific level of proficiency on Grade 10 English Language Arts (ELA); Mathematics; and Science, Technology, and Engineering (STE) statewide assessments administered through the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) or MCAS-Alt for students needing an alternate mode of testing; and
- 2) meet local graduation requirements for the LEA awarding the diploma.

Students receiving a diploma in four years or less are counted as graduates for the purposes of reporting these data in the SPP/APR.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

*Note: the targets for 2018 and 2019 have been revised to correspond with the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State revised its target for FFY 2018 and provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must 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.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	4.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	3.30%	3.00%	2.70%	2.40%	2.10%
Data	3.30%	3.32%	3.50%	3.13%	3.29%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	1.70%	1.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	8,415
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	595
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	550
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,701
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	20

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

OSEP allows states to use the same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY10 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012 (identified as "Option 2" in the Part B Indicator Measurement Table). In Massachusetts, dropout rate calculations are based on an annual event. Using the calculation of the number of students with IEPs enrolled in grades 9-12 during the 2017-2018 school year as the denominator, and the number of students with IEPs enrolled in grades 9-12 who dropped out during the 2017-2018 school year in the numerator, MA DESE calculates a dropout of 3.36%. This does not meet the annual target of 1.7 and is a slight increase over FFY17 (3.29%).

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,551	46,115	3.29%	1.70%	3.36%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

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 to transfer to another public school and who does not re-enroll before the following October 1 reporting.

To calculate this rate, MA DESE uses dropout data obtained through the Student Information Management System (SIMS) October 1 enrollment report. Students who were reported as a "dropout" at the end of the previous year and then enrolled prior to the October 1 reporting date are removed from the dropout count. MA DESE also removes from the data set any student who dropped out of high school but earned a GED/HISET certificate.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In order to set new targets for Indicator 2, MA DESE engaged in a review of longitudinal data and activities. Our review showed a larger than expected number of the dropouts this past year were Hispanic (35%), and that the primary disability category identified for most dropouts during this period was Emotional (31.5%). The results point to areas of potential focus for targeted improvement and support strategies as we move forward with our agenda. Although previous targets were aspirational, and MA DESE has not met the Indicator 2 targets in recent years, the Special Education Advisory Panel recently affirmed its support for maintaining low targets and has recommended specific actions that could be taken by MA DESE and LEAs to lower the dropout rate going forward. The extended targets reported here reflect that priority.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State revised its target for FFY 2018 and provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate 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.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
A	Overall	97.60%	Actual	98.80%	97.23%	97.75%	98.45%	98.51%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%	99.00%
A	Overall	97.70%	Actual	99.01%	97.41%	97.54%	98.45%	98.48%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	99.00%	99.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	99.00%	99.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual

meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

The MA DESE, in consultation with the Special Education Advisory Panel, previously set Indicator 3 targets through FFY 2018. In setting these targets the Panel reviewed statewide longitudinal data, improvement activities, and State policies, including the ESEA waiver granted by the U.S. Department of Education. The Panel recommended Indicator 3 targets based on the ESEA waiver, and supported setting ambitious targets for Indicator 3, as this reflects the State's commitment that all students, regardless of disability, participate in the State's assessment system.

At its January 2020 meeting, the Advisory Panel reviewed the previously established targets and endorsed maintaining the same target of 99% participation for reading and math assessments through FFY 2019.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	13,835	14,586	14,935	14,770	14,532	13,839		12,647			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,956	2,712	2,421	2,129	2,198	2,070		1,501			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	8,731	10,718	11,277	11,492	11,112	10,542		9,817			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	988	1,003	1,105	966	1,032	943		907			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	13,860	14,581	14,939	14,771	14,528	13,842		12,592			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,324	2,265	1,811	1,733	1,693	1,690		1,391			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	9,426	11,187	11,909	11,910	11,609	10,944		9,798			

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,009	1,019	1,119	973	1,051	959		914			

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	99,144	97,620	98.51%	99.00%	98.46%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	99,113	97,734	98.48%	99.00%	98.61%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

As required by 34 CFR § 300.160(f), Massachusetts publicly reports on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of children without disabilities, including participation rates and performance results on regular assessments at the district and school levels. Participation results for students with disabilities, including the participation of students with disabilities at the district and school levels, in regular assessments, with and without accommodations, and in MCAS-Alt assessments are available on the MA DESE website: <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/participation.aspx>.

Performance results for students with disabilities on the regular state assessment, with and without accommodations and at both the district and school levels, is available on MA DESE's website at <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/nextgenmcas.aspx>. As of FFY 2018, all students in grades 3-8, and 10 are now taking the Next-Generation MCAS in both reading and mathematics. Performance results for the old legacy MCAS are still available here: <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/mcas.aspx>. The results, on both of these pages, are sortable by report type (district or school), year, grade, school type, and student group, including students with disabilities. To view for different subgroups, including students with disabilities, use the dropdown menus. To view students with disabilities, use the student group menu on the top right of the page to select "Students w/disabilities," and then click the "View Report" button. To switch between district and school level data, use the "Report Type" menu. Select either "District" or "School," and then click the "View Report" button.

MA DESE reports performance results for students with disabilities who participate in the MCAS-Alt in a separate report found here: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/mcas_alt.aspx. All students participating in the administration of the MCAS-Alt are students with disabilities. The MCAS-Alt results page is sortable by report type (district or school), year, and subject. To switch between district and school level data, use the "Report Type" menu. Select either "District" or "School," and then click the "View Report" button.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Different than in prior SPP/APRs, the above participation rates reported above exclude from the denominator first year English learners (reading only), and students with medically documented absences (reading and math). Upon reviewing the Indicator 3 data prepopulated from other data reports submitted separately by MA DESE, MA DESE noted this discrepancy from prior years' reporting.

The children not included are broken down by assessment type, as follows:

- For reading (English Language Arts (ELA)), 94 students did not participate because they were first year English Language Learners and 371 students did not participate due to a medically documented absence. These students are not included in the above calculations.
- For math, 423 students did not participate due to a medically documented absence, and were not included in the calculations above.

The 1993 Massachusetts Education Reform Law, M.G.L. c. 69, § 11, mandates that all students educated with Massachusetts public funds participate in MCAS testing. MA DESE regularly updates its student participation requirements, (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/participation.html?section=gr3-8and10>) and information about accessibility and accommodations (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/accessibility/>) to support students' access to statewide assessments.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2018	Target >=				50.00%	60.00%
A	Overall	16.69%	Actual	30.79%	31.73%	33.73%	19.68%	21.35%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2018	Target >=				50.00%	60.00%
A	Overall	15.31%	Actual	22.48%	22.71%	24.71%	17.39%	17.36%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall		20.00%
Math	A >=	Overall		19.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to

discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

In FFY 2016, MA DESE introduced a new statewide assessment, the Next-Generation Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). With this new statewide assessment, MA DESE no longer reports proficiency rates and CPI scores, as it had in the past. For reporting purposes as required by the SPP/APR, MA DESE has reported "Meeting Expectations" and "Exceeding Expectations" on the Next-Generation MCAS as "proficient."

Although historical records indicate that FFY 2016 was a new baseline year, in practice, FFY 2018 is the first year that all students who were tested took the Next-Generation MCAS, and therefore FFY 2018 should be considered the baseline year going forward.

Throughout the multi-year process of designing and implementing the Next-Generation MCAS, and corresponding updates to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, MA DESE developed a robust stakeholder engagement process, led by an oversight committee, inclusive of members of the MA DESE Board of Education and a Next-Generation MCAS steering committee. Further, MA DESE formed the following project advisory teams and work groups comprised of stakeholders and experts:

- Project Communications
- Procurement Management
- Test Administration
- High School Testing
- English Language Arts and Mathematics Curriculum Standards Review Panels
- Standard Setting Policy Committee
- MCAS Accessibility
- Standard-Setting Committee
- Digital Learning Advisory Council
- Test Content Review panels
- MCAS Technical Advisory Committee
- School and District Accountability and Assistance Advisory Council
- History and Social Science

To solicit participation in these work groups, MA DESE contacted approximately fifty associations and groups representing families and students, the state Special Education Advisory Council, curricular experts, special education stakeholders, teachers, and administrators, among others.

At its December 2018 meeting, MA DESE and the MA Special Education Advisory Panel discussed the implementation of the Next-Generation MCAS and its impact on students with disabilities. The Panel was interested in understanding and reviewing the proficiency measurements on the Next-Generation MCAS. MA DESE also reviewed with the Panel the State's newly implemented accountability system (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/>). MA DESE revisited target setting with the Advisory Panel at its January 2020 meeting. The Advisory Panel endorsed setting FFY 2018 as a new baseline year and new targets for FFY 2019 of 20% for reading and 19% for math proficiency, reflecting statewide results under the gradual implementation of the Next-Generation MCAS. Moving forward, MA DESE will continue to engage its special education stakeholders in discussions around proficiency on the Next-Generation MCAS. As more years of assessment results are available, allowing for year over year comparison, MA DESE, with support from the IDEA Data Center and in collaboration with the Advisory Panel, will continue to update targets that are rigorous yet reflective of actual and anticipated growth.

Please see the FFY 2018 Data tab in the "Additional Information" section for a more detailed description of the MA DESE's new statewide assessment and the implications for this report.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	13,678	14,440	14,815	14,596	14,359	13,581		12,271			

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,265	815	698	617	456	515		526			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,713	1,677	1,639	1,643	1,221	1,359		2,165			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0		0			

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	13,720	14,445	14,815	14,580	14,325	13,571		12,096			
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,129	802	591	578	431	406		428			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,370	1,711	1,599	1,634	1,368	1,109		1,777			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0	0	0	0		0			

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	97,740	16,309	21.35%		16.69%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	97,552	14,933	17.36%		15.31%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

As required by 34 CFR 300.160(f), Massachusetts publicly reports on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, including performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments at the district and school levels.

Performance results for students with disabilities on the regular state assessment, with and without accommodations and at both the district and school levels, is available on MA DESE's website at <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/nextgenmcas.aspx>. As of FFY 2018, all students in grades 3-8, and 10 are now taking the Next-Generation MCAS in both reading and math. Performance results for the legacy MCAS are still available here: <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/mcas.aspx>. The results, on both of these pages, are sortable by report type (district or school), year, grade, school type, and student group, including students with disabilities. To view for different subgroups, including students with disabilities, use the dropdown menus. To view students with disabilities, use the student group menu on the top right of the page to select "Students w/disabilities," and then click the "View Report" button. To switch between district and school level data, use the "Report Type" menu. Select either "District" or "School," and then click the "View Report" button.

MA DESE publicly reports performance results for students with disabilities who participate in the MCAS-Alt in a separate report found here: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/mcas_alt.aspx. All students participating in the administration of the MCAS-Alt are students with disabilities. The MCAS-Alt result page is sortable by report type (district or school), year, and subjects. To switch between district and school level data, use the "Report Type" menu. Select either "District" or "School," and then click the "View Report" button.

Please note that MA DESE has reported Meeting Expectations and Exceeding Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS as proficient for SPP/APR reporting requirements, but MA DESE reporting for the Next-Generation MCAS to the public no longer uses the designation of "proficiency."

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Accountability System Changes

In the 2017-2018 school year, Massachusetts began implementing a new statewide accountability system (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/>). The system measures school and LEA performance in meeting student needs, as well as the type and amount of support that schools and LEAs need from the state. This new accountability system includes additional accountability indicators that provide a more in-depth analysis of school and LEA needs. The new system eliminates the five assistance levels that characterized the previous accountability system and replaces them with accountability categories that define progress and the support that LEAs are receiving from MA DESE. The system also shifted away from measuring an LEA based on its lowest performing school and now focuses on LEA-level data.

Next-Generation MCAS

Over the last few years, MA DESE has gradually implemented a new statewide assessment, called the Next-Generation MCAS. Compared to the legacy MCAS, the new assessment better aligns to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and better measures students' preparation for the next grade level and college/career readiness. The Next-Generation MCAS also incorporates new, more rigorous test content that is aligned to standards that reflect higher expectations for college readiness and proficiency at the next grade level. Beginning in the spring of 2019, all students in grades 3-8 and grade 10 now take the Next-Generation MCAS in reading (English Language Arts (ELA)) and math. For reporting purposes as required by the SPP/APR, MA DESE reports student scores of Meeting Expectations and Exceeding Expectations as proficient. More information on the Next-Gen MCAS is available here: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/nextgen/resources.html>.

FFY 2016 was the first year students in grades 3-8 took the Next-Generation MCAS, and students in grade 10 were phased into this new assessment program in FFY 2018. Because this is the first year that MA DESE is reporting data from the first statewide administration of Next-Generation MCAS in all grade levels, Indicator 3C proficiency scores in FFY 2018 cannot be compared to scores reported in prior years when the reported proficiency rate included results from both the legacy assessments and the Next-Generation MCAS, or the legacy MCAS test only; FFY 2018 is a new baseline year for Indicator 3C.

As Massachusetts transitioned to statewide administration of the Next-Generation MCAS, MA DESE maintained its previous targets set in consultation with the Advisory Panel. Now that students at all grade levels are being assessed using the Next-Generation MCAS, MA DESE and the Advisory Panel revisited those targets in January 2020 and established FFY 2018 the new baseline year. The Panel and MA DESE have identified Indicator 3C proficiency targets at 20% for reading and 19% for math moving forward with the Next-Generation MCAS.

Resources and general information related to the MCAS are available here: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/>. Detailed information about the Next-Generation MCAS, including updates and resources, is available here: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/nextgen/>.

Improving Outcomes for Students with Disabilities

MA DESE is committed to improving outcomes for all students, especially for students with disabilities. MA DESE recognizes that the low percentage of

students with disabilities who are Meeting Expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS is unacceptable and that improvement activities must include an increased focus on improving instruction. Some of the activities that MA DESE is doing are:

1. emphasizing Universal Design for Learning in inclusive environments which are at the forefront of the professional development activities across the state;
2. supporting LEAs in the building of robust multi-tiered systems of supports;
3. providing professional development and intensive intervention strategies in literacy, math and inclusive practices;
4. implementing the IEP improvement Project to update and create a more robust IEP process;
5. focusing on supporting students with neurological learning disabilities, in particular dyslexia; and
6. implementing the new accountability system to support LEAs to find direct connections between compliance and performance.

To this end, MA DESE and districts work together to support students with disabilities to:

- individualize instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners,
- create universally designed learning opportunities,
- teach with poverty in mind,
- build cultural competency,
- address disproportionate and excessive student suspensions,
- support homeless students, and
- make schools safe for vulnerable students, such as LGBTQ students, recent immigrants, and others.

As MA DESE and the Massachusetts Board of Education in collaboration with stakeholders move this work forward, MA DESE looks forward to continuing to report in future SPP/APR periods on the continued implementation of the Next-Generation MCAS and revised student accountability targets for students with IEPs, and to demonstrate improvement in students' proficiency rates.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: 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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) 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 that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	1.92%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.75%	1.00%	1.25%	1.92%	1.36%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and

educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee’s primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state’s progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State’s general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state’s Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year’s report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE’s special education agenda.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

34

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State’s minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4	372	1.36%	0.00%	1.08%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The state’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology is the number of districts with five times the State’s rate of suspension and expulsion for more than 10 days for students with IEPs divided by the number of districts that met the “n” size of 30 multiplied by 100. Districts who meet the criteria of “n” size requirements and have a discrepancy rate of five times the state average for two consecutive years are found to have a significant discrepancy.

Because of the data lag required for indicator 4 reporting, data reported here is reviewed for the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years. The FFY 2016 school year showed an overall State average for suspension or expulsion for greater than 10 days for all students at 0.614%. Districts that suspended students with disabilities at five times this rate were found to have a discrepancy in that year. For the FFY 2017 school year, the overall State average for suspension or expulsion for greater than 10 days for all students was 0.5834%. Districts that suspended students with disabilities at five times this rate were found to have a discrepancy in that year. Districts meeting these criteria for both FFY 2016 and 2017 (two consecutive years) were identified as having a significant discrepancy. Overall, four (1.07%) of school districts have a significant discrepancy during this reporting year.

Discipline data are reported by the school districts to MA DESE using the School Safety and Discipline Report (SSDR). The SSDR includes all incidents involving bullying, drug, violent, or crime related offenses on school property and any other offenses that result in a disciplinary action which removes the student from the regular educational environment, including both in- and out-of-school suspensions.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

MA DESE uses the same methodology for reviewing policies, practices and procedures (PPPs) for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for both Indicators 4A and 4B.

Assessing the appropriateness of the PPPs regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral and instructional interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards has been a coordinated and collaborative process among several offices at MA DESE. MA DESE verifies compliance of LEAs PPPs through its focused monitoring review process, including special education monitoring criteria that addresses these focus areas. MA DESE also assesses corrective action reports and progress reports completed by LEAs in all other areas of identified noncompliance to assesses whether the noncompliance contributed to the discrepancy in indicators 4A and 4B. Any deficiencies in the PPPs must be corrected by the LEA within one year from date of notification and the LEA must submit evidence of the corrections to MA DESE for verification.

In this focused process. MA DESE verified that the four LEAs identified through data analysis as having significant discrepancy had policies, practices, and procedures that were compliant with the relevant IDEA requirements and MA DESE made no findings of noncompliance for this reporting period that must be corrected. Nonetheless, MA DESE is supporting the districts' participation in the Rethinking Discipline Professional Learning Network, which includes targeted assistance conversations with staff from the MA DESE Offices of Student and Family Support, Special Education Planning and Policy, and Charter Schools and School Redesign. This engagement includes discussion of district specific data, as well as information about successful strategies that LEAs have implemented and challenges they are facing related to student discipline and behavioral support for students. Participating LEAs reflect on policies, practices, and procedures in order to provide necessary support to students with IEPs and reduce the districts' use of disciplinary removal in the future.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups 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 that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups 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 for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2017	0.51%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.25%	0.00%	0.50%	0.51%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
-----	------	------

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

8

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
8	0	398	0.51%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

MA DESE's definition of significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions (for greater than 10 days in a school year) of students with IEPs who are members of a specific racial/ethnic group is a suspension/ expulsion rate of five times the state rate for all students for three consecutive years. During FFY 2017 the state rate of all students statewide who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days is .0058; five times the state rate is .029 or 2.9%. (Please note that because Indicator 4 is reported using a one-year lag, the final year of data analysis reported here is from FFY 2017.) Therefore, LEAs meeting the State's definition of significant discrepancy if they:

- met the minimum "n" size of 10 students with IEPs in a particular racial/ethnic group; and
- more than 2.9% (five times the state rate) of students with an IEP who are members of a particular racial /ethnic group were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days over the course of the 2017-2018 school year;
- and the identified LEA had similar data for the two prior school years.

Discipline data are reported by the school districts to MA DESE using the School Safety and Discipline Report (SSDR). The SSDR includes all incidents involving bullying, drug, violent, or crime related offenses on school property and any other offenses that result in a disciplinary action removing the student from the regular educational environment, including both in- and out-of-school suspensions.

Although 407 LEAs were in operation during the 2017-2018 school year, MA DESE has overwritten the data for indicator 4B, removing from the calculation those LEAs that did not have data for each year of the calculation or did not meet the the state's minimum "n" size for all reporting years. Data reported here is on the 398 LEAs that met the state's "n" size requirement for Indicator 4B.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

By reviewing information, inclusive of monitoring progress reports, policies, procedures and action plans, MA DESE verified that these LEAs were correctly implementing all regulatory requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. MA DESE determined that there is no noncompliance identified for the 8 discrepant LEAs identified above.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

By reviewing subsequent information, inclusive of monitoring progress reports, revised policies, procedures and action plans, and student level data for each LEA in the FFY 17 APR identified as non-compliant, MA DESE verified that these LEAs were correctly implementing all regulatory requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, and had corrected

each individual case of noncompliance within one year. MA DESE determined that all noncompliance has been corrected within one year of identification, and there is no outstanding noncompliance identified in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

MA DESE reviewed LEA PPPs regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards through its public school monitoring process. MA DESE verified each individual case of noncompliance was corrected through review of corrective action plans, progress reports and related student level incident data. The two LEAs found noncompliant with regarding to reported policies and procedures were ordered to take corrective action to address areas of identified noncompliance by submitting a corrective action plan with corresponding progress reports through the public school monitoring process and a Rethinking Discipline action plan for review and approval. MA DESE then reviewed this information and additional LEA information to determine that the LEA had submitted evidence of correction. Within one year of identification of noncompliance, MA DESE verified appropriate corrections had been made and the LEAs have in place compliant policies and procedures, and are appropriately implementing the regulatory requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral intervention and support, as well as procedural safeguards.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 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.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 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.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	60.50%	60.50%	61.00%	61.00%	61.50%
A	49.10%	Data	61.07%	61.86%	62.34%	62.82%	63.83%
B	2005	Target <=	14.50%	14.50%	14.50%	14.40%	14.40%
B	15.70%	Data	14.67%	14.43%	14.05%	13.82%	13.40%
C	2005	Target <=	5.50%	5.50%	5.50%	5.50%	5.40%
C	6.70%	Data	6.82%	6.86%	6.81%	6.93%	6.86%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	61.50%	61.50%
Target B <=	14.30%	14.30%
Target C <=	5.40%	5.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as

well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	158,250
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	102,902
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	20,914
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	9,247
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	979
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	172

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	102,902	158,250	63.83%	61.50%	65.02%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	20,914	158,250	13.40%	14.30%	13.22%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	10,398	158,250	6.86%	5.40%	6.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

MA DESE has identified multiple LEAs that have unusually high or low rates of use of substantially separate settings. We are working with these LEAs to analyze evaluation and placement data, review local practices and procedures, and assess the appropriateness of placement decisions for the student population. MA DESE, the participating LEAs, and partner educational collaboratives are identifying successful practices and augmenting school and district systems to better support inclusive activity. A cadre of trainers are available statewide from sixteen educational collaboratives to support all LEAS in the content area of inclusive education environments.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# 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) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%
A	23.90%	Data	47.29%	48.94%	53.05%	53.68%	54.41%
B	2011	Target <=	13.80%	13.50%	13.20%	12.80%	12.40%
B	14.00%	Data	15.54%	15.34%	15.44%	16.74%	16.80%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	50.00%	50.00%
Target B <=	12.40%	12.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and

compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	18,377
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	10,064
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,771
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	202
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	3

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	10,064	18,377	54.41%	50.00%	54.76%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	2,976	18,377	16.80%	12.40%	16.19%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

MA DESE and its partners and stakeholders have a long-standing commitment to promoting community-based inclusive opportunities for young children with disabilities. This commitment continues with an expansion of the "Building Inclusive Communities" initiative for preschool children as described below. In FFY 2016, MA DESE and the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) established a steering committee to develop action plans and design strategies for building relationships with families and community partners. This past year, EEC and MA DESE have collaborated to convene a stakeholder group of the mixed delivery system to develop and publish a policy paper designed to provide guidance about Least Restrictive Environment in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE).

Building Inclusive Communities in Early Childhood Initiative (BIC)

EEC contracted with the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES) to organize logistics for the Building Inclusive Community (BIC) Series in collaboration with MA DESE. Two nationally renowned experts, Drs. Rich Villa and Jacque Thousand, are supporting the school and LEA leaders in engaged in the BIC initiative by providing a professional development and coaching series for participating educators. The premise of the series is to improve educational supports for preschool-age children with disabilities by increasing the use of effective inclusion practices in early learning settings. Ten (10) preschool teams are participating in intensive instruction and coaching with Drs. Villa and Thousand. The professional learning community for local inclusive preschool teams has access to webinars focused on gathering information about federal policies and national research on inclusion and inclusive practices in early childhood, which are used to inform the teams' Inclusive Preschool Action Plan; and works together to identify strategies for building relationships with families to engage them in discussion related to early childhood inclusion.

The first BIC conference in school year 2019-2020 was held on October 21, 2019. The participants represented the mixed delivery system (public schools, early care and education programs, early intervention, head start and Preschool Expansion Grantees). The keynote address, "Inclusive Early Childhood Education: Equity and Excellence for All," reflected MA DESE's and EEC's shared commitment of promoting equitable, high quality services for young children with disabilities.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

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.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%	
A1	85.61%	Data	85.44%	87.20%	79.14%	88.70%	85.61%

A2	2017	Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	49.00%	
A2	47.00%	Data	44.49%	47.81%	53.57%	47.74%	47.00%
B1	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.00%	
B1	84.90%	Data	81.37%	83.89%	78.19%	85.47%	84.90%
B2	2017	Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	48.00%	
B2	48.39%	Data	44.28%	45.93%	52.62%	46.48%	48.39%
C1	2017	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	85.00%	
C1	85.51%	Data	84.78%	85.90%	80.84%	89.31%	85.51%
C2	2017	Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	62.00%	
C2	60.46%	Data	58.90%	60.33%	61.58%	63.73%	60.46%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	86.00%	86.00%
Target A2 >=	50.00%	50.00%
Target B1 >=	85.00%	85.00%
Target B2 >=	49.00%	49.00%
Target C1 >=	86.00%	86.00%
Target C2 >=	63.00%	63.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Beginning with FFY 2013, MA DESE set targets based on the state's expectation that most, if not all, students with disabilities who enter the preschool program below age expectations should substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they exit the program or turn six (i.e., FFY 2013 through FFY 2016 Summary Statement 1 target = 100%). Additionally, these targets reflect the belief that educators will be able to guide the majority of preschool children with disabilities to reach their full potential by the time they exit the program or turn six (i.e., FFY 2013 through FFY 2016 Summary Statement 2 target = 90%).

While the state has observed positive trends over time across outcomes measures, in particular for Summary Statement 1, the rigorous targets established for FFY 2013 and beyond had not been achieved. During the fall of 2018, the MA DESE and the Massachusetts Special Education Advisory Panel worked to reframe and reset the targets, striving to make them more realistic on a year-to-year basis while still being rigorous. The objective was

to shift to establishing targets that could be used to monitor annual progress, rather than to view the targets as the overall goal. The belief of both MA DESE and the Advisory Panel is that having more achievable targets will allow MA DESE to continue to support educators in their work with preschool children with disabilities. By setting targets that can be met or exceeded, it also allows the State and its LEAs to demonstrate progress as we continue to maintain high expectations and help all preschool children with disabilities reach their full potential. After a process of internal analysis and review at MA DESE, as explained below, new targets were discussed, reviewed, and approved by the Panel for FFY 2017 and beyond.

FFY 2017-FFY 2020 Target review process

Based on the recommendation of the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) during FFY 2017, Massachusetts reset future targets, beginning with FFY 2017. MA DESE reviewed and analyzed available data for Indicator 7 (FFYs 2008 through 2017). As part of this process, MA DESE received guidance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC) regarding how to approach this process most effectively.

In consultation with the Advisory Panel at its December 11, 2018 meeting, MA DESE revised Indicator 7 targets. After a detailed review of the Indicator 7 data, MA DESE brought three target setting proposals to Panel for its consideration. The members of the Panel advocated for maintaining high standards for the students of Massachusetts while also establishing targets that could be used meaningfully to help support the work of educators across the State. As a result, they endorsed the model establishing targets in FFY 2018 as the average over the prior four years (FFY 2014 to FFY 2017). During the FFY 2017 SPP/APR clarification period, however, OSEP rejected the new proposed targets because the State's targets for FFY 2018 for summary statements A2 and B2 did not reflect improvement over the baseline data. OSEP required MA DESE to revise its FFY 2018 targets to reflect improvement. As a result of this instruction, MA DESE reexamined the state's Indicator 7 baseline and subsequent targets. After further analysis and consultation with OSEP, MA DESE updated Indicator 7 baselines and reassessed the targets previously established with the Advisory Panel at its December 2018 meeting.

MA DESE has reported FFY 2017 as a new baseline year because of the expansion of data collection activities during that period related to this indicator and Massachusetts' State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for the SSIP is devoted to improving the outcomes for preschool children with disabilities (i.e., Indicator 7). MA DESE also reviewed the targets for FFY 2018 through FFY 2020 to determine any necessary revisions. The new targets for FFY 2018 and beyond are above the FFY 2017 baseline, as instructed by OSEP. MA DESE maintained any FFY 2018 targets set by the Advisory Panel at its December 11, 2018 meeting that were above the FFY 2017 baseline. This resulted in MA DESE resetting the FFY 2018 targets, from the original FFY 2017 target proposals, for B1.

The revised targets for FFY 2018 through FFY 2020 are as follows:

FFY 2018 FFY 2019

A1 86% 86%

A2 50% 50%

B1 85% 85%

B2 49% 49%

C1 86% 86%

C2 63% 63%

The rigorous targets reflect the State's overall goals for this indicator, and continue to maintain high expectations for all preschool students with disabilities.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,045

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	10	0.96%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	123	11.77%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	431	41.24%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	333	31.87%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	148	14.16%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. 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	764	897	85.61%	86.00%	85.17%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	481	1,045	47.00%	50.00%	46.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	1.34%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	133	12.73%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	411	39.33%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	336	32.15%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	151	14.45%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. 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 turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	747	894	84.90%	85.00%	83.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	487	1,045	48.39%	49.00%	46.60%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7	0.67%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	105	10.05%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	299	28.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	399	38.18%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	235	22.49%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the	698	810	85.51%	86.00%	86.17%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	634	1,045	60.46%	63.00%	60.67%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B1	<p>MA DESE's goal is to meet and exceed the rigorous targets that have been established for this measure. We are mindful that there can be a variety of reasons for changes in the data, including data quality, changes in programs, and/or changes in the population being served. This past year saw an increase of 64% in the number of usable records for Indicator 7. This increase in data collection and reporting, as supported by MA DESE through improved and more frequent outreach, and the increase in SSIP district data, may explain the slight fluctuation in the results.</p> <p>To better understand the extent of slippage, we compared the results using the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) Meaningful Differences Calculator to determine whether there was a statistical difference year-to-year (http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomes-calc.asp). For [B1, B2], proportional differences from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 were not found to be significant, based on a 90% confidence interval. Due to relatively small n's of these samples (651 and 1045 respectively), results were also compared using a chi-square test of independence to assess proportional differences. Differences were not found to be significant a p<.05. Based on these results, it appears as though the difference from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 represents a stable result on this measure.</p>
B2	<p>MA DESE's goal is to meet and exceed the rigorous targets that have been established for this measure. We are mindful that there can be a variety of reasons for changes in the data, including data quality, changes in programs, and/or changes in the population being served. This past year saw an increase of 64% in the number of usable records for Indicator 7. This increase in data collection and reporting, as supported by MA DESE through improved and more frequent outreach, and the increase in SSIP district data, may explain the slight fluctuation in the results.</p> <p>To better understand the extent of slippage, we compared the results using the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) Meaningful Differences Calculator to determine whether there was a statistical difference year-to-year (http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/childoutcomes-calc.asp). For [B1, B2], proportional differences from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 were not found to be significant, based on a 90% confidence interval. Due to relatively small n's of these samples (651 and 1045 respectively), results were also compared using a chi-square test of independence to assess proportional differences. Differences were not found to be significant a p<.05. Based on these results, it appears as though the difference from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 represents a stable result on this measure.</p>

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

MA DESE and the MA Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) collaboratively selected a cohort model for the purpose of this indicator's reporting activities. Massachusetts divides districts into four cohorts, with each cohort being representative of the State. Further information about this OSEP-approved cohort model can be found at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/datacollection.html>. According to the cohort schedule, LEAs collect entry data for students once every four years as part of their assigned cohort. Data collection and reporting activities for those participating LEAs continue for approximately three years following entry data, until all originally assessed students have exited from or terminated early childhood special education services. Once all the children from the cohort have exited from early childhood special education, the LEA participates in the next cycle of data collection efforts with a new cohort of entering eligible students.

In addition to the cohort model described above, MA DESE collects additional early childhood outcomes data as part of the Massachusetts State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Through SSIP, MA DESE is currently working with 30 districts to implement the Pyramid Model for Promoting the Social and Emotional Development of Infants and Young Children (the Pyramid Model) to support improved social-emotional outcomes. Participating SSIP districts began collecting and reporting Indicator 7 data every year starting in FFY 2015, and other districts have continued to be represented in the approved cohort collection model. (The number of participating SSIP districts was 19 at that time, and has since expanded to 24 districts.) The SSIP districts include several of the largest districts in Massachusetts; preschool enrollment of young children with disabilities in these districts represents more than 21% of the total population of students with disabilities aged three to five in the state. Progress on Indicator 7 as it relates to the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) for Indicator 17 for SSIP districts specifically is reported in the appropriate section of this report.

In August 2016, MA DESE changed the data collection parameters for districts collecting only entry data beginning with Cohort 4. Districts collected

entry data on students who began receiving special education services between August 1 and May 31 of the following year. This change continued for FFY 2018, with districts in this reporting cycle collecting data between August 1, 2018 and May 31, 2019. This expanded data collection window, combined with the SSIP districts' data mentioned above, and improved and more frequent outreach by MA DESE to districts this past year about the data collection activities, have likely contributed to an increase in the number of usable records for Indicator 7 in FFY 2017 (64%), and a 61% increase from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018.

MA DESE continues to work toward increasing districts' capacity for reporting high quality data to ensure valid and reliable results. MA DESE and EEC are currently conducting hands-on training sessions in coordination with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) to help build statewide capacity among its master cadre of coaches to support LEAs in collecting and using data via the Child Outcomes Summary Process.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

MA DESE uses the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process and collects data using a cohort model described above.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

MA DESE continues to provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs for this indicator in two ways, to support both data quality and to improve child outcomes: 1) assistance with the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, including training to improve general knowledge about child development and functional assessments; and 2) training, including coaching, to implement evidence based practices to improve child level outcomes.

At this time, MA DESE is in the process of designing and delivering hands-on training sessions in coordination with ECTA to help build statewide capacity among its master cadre of external coaches. The goal of the sessions is to continue to build coaches' capacity for supporting all LEAs in collecting, reporting, and using high-quality data, and in particular, assisting LEAs in using program-level child outcomes data for program planning and improvement.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

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.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

MA DESE meets annually with the Statewide Special Education Advisory Panel to review Indicator 8 data including survey questions, response rate, and agreement rate. The Panel makes recommendations based on the data presented. MA DESE met with the Panel to review data and targets most recently at its December 2018 meeting, and shared updated data and information with the Panel at its January 2020 meeting.

To set Indicator 8 current targets through FFY 2018, MA DESE worked with the Panel and stakeholder groups focused on family engagement to review

longitudinal data for Indicator 8, improvement activities, and state policy regarding the facilitation of parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. The groups also assessed the application of the Family, School, and Community Partnership Fundamentals (June 2012) (see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/fscp-fundamentals.docx>) in evaluating appropriate targets for Indicator 8. The current targets were developed in December 2015 and have been endorsed annually by the Panel.

At the December 2018 Panel meeting, stakeholders participated in discussions regarding data representativeness and the collection of demographic information from families completing the Parent Survey. Stakeholder feedback indicated an understanding of the value of collecting demographic information. Members also expressed caution about the collection of unnecessary information, the reluctance of families to provide information, and the reality that many families may face challenges in completing a parent survey.

Stakeholders were also asked to review and discuss setting targets in preparation for FFY 2018. Members discussed maintaining the FFY 2018 target of 86.5% for two additional years, allowing MA DESE to focus on increasing representativeness and responses. To demonstrate our goals of improvement in the area of parent involvement, MA DESE will set the target for FFY19 at 89.5% . The Panel intends to re-examine targets in school year 2020-2021.

Historical Data

Baseline	2018	89.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.50%	86.00%
Data	79.85%	84.98%	81.01%	82.94%	80.82%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	86.50%	89.50%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,205	3,601	80.82%	86.50%	89.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

42,828

Percentage of respondent parents

8.41%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

In FFY 2018, MA DESE collected Indicator 8 data as part of the Tiered Focus Monitoring process (TFM) through a parent survey. To facilitate access and response, MA DESE made the surveys available online, through mobile device, via email, or in hard copy. Information regarding the Parent Survey was sent by MA DESE to families of students with IEPs, ages 3-21, in the LEAs. Separate preschool surveys were not used; the questions used in the Parent Survey were developed to include families with children in Early Childhood Special Education and are appropriate for all populations. FFY 2018 data indicates that 2.43% of all respondents represent children in Preschool-Grade 5.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	YES
If yes, provide sampling plan.	Indicator 8_Letter amending data collection and reporting activities_6-2019

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

The FFY 2018 cohort reported Indicator 8 data using the parent survey administered through the Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM) process. Each year a representative group of LEAs participates in the TFM process, including urban, suburban, rural, large, medium and small LEAs, as well as the full range of LEA program and structure types (charter, virtual, CVTE, and comprehensive). These LEAs serve a full range of student disability types and need for services, such that the TFM process is representative of the State as a whole. The TFM survey also includes demographic questions related to race/ethnicity, gender, placement and grade span.

MA DESE fully integrated Indicator 8 data collection into the TFM process beginning in FFY 2018. DESE believes this integration will provide benefits to LEAs and to MA DESE. LEAs will no longer need to facilitate collection of two parent surveys as part of monitoring activities and Indicator 8 data collection. Also, integrated procedures at MA DESE will promote improved internal coordination of activities that support parent engagement. Redundancies in paperwork, data collection, and compliance activities will be eliminated, enhancing LEAs' capacity for self-assessment and service delivery, and MA DESE's capacity for providing technical and targeted assistance. Data from the TFM Parent Survey also will better inform MA DESE's

other monitoring activities with LEAs, allowing for MA DESE to better connect survey results with other identified areas of concern.

To ensure the broadest representation of respondents, surveys are made available for all families of children with an IEP in LEAs participating in the identified TFM cohort. In FFY 2018, 95 LEAs participated. MA DESE does not have concerns about the validity and reliability of its sampling method for Indicator 8, as parent responses to the parent surveys are submitted directly by families to MA DESE. However, MA DESE recognizes that its FFY 2018 response rate of 8.4% is low. Because of the low response rate, MA DESE has low confidence in the data for basing conclusions about family engagement or parental satisfaction for the LEAs involved. MA DESE continues to analyze existing resources and outreach in order to design additional efforts to increase the survey response rate.

Because the sampling plan has been changed, MA DESE is setting a new baseline for FFY 2018.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	Special_Education_Parent_Survey-English_Boston SY 2018-2019 (11) (1)
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

MA DESE collected Indicator 8 data in FFY 2018 using a survey available to families in LEAs participating in the TFM process. To encourage the broadest representation of respondents, LEAs participating in data collection activities made surveys available to families of students with IEPs in the LEAs. While MA DESE does not have concerns about the validity and reliability of the data reported because parent responses to the surveys are submitted directly to MA DESE by families, MA DESE cannot confirm that the results are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, however. MA DESE collected demographic information regarding grade span, placement, gender and race/ethnicity. Through analysis, MA DESE determined that the data collected are not representative, as described in the section below.

MA DESE recognizes that its FFY 2018 response rate of 8.4% is low. Because of the low response rate, MA DESE has low confidence in the data for basing conclusions about family engagement or parental satisfaction for the LEAs involved in the data collection and reporting activities. MA DESE continues to analyze existing resources and outreach in order to design additional efforts to increase its response rate and representatives of the survey results.

MA DESE is taking specific steps to increase representatives of data. The data collection methodology for Indicator 8 is designed to support broad representation of survey respondents to promote validity and reliability in reporting. Additionally, MA DESE works with the identified LEAs to make the survey available in several formats to all families of students with IEPs, aged 3 through 21, who are enrolled in the LEA. Multiple input modalities allow for responses online, through mobile devices, and as a printed survey. For FFY 2018, MA DESE activities to increase response rate include reviewing representativeness to determine which families are not responding, including any findings of trends in the final TFM exit meeting and developing targeted technical assistance for the LEAs to develop plans to better support families in accessing the survey.

MA DESE is using the IDEA Data Center's Parent Involvement Data Toolkit to assist in the analysis of data relative to representativeness. As a result, and through discussion with the Special Education Advisory Panel members, MA DESE is collecting demographic information for race/ethnicity, placement, gender and grade span. MA DESE is also working on develop an Indicator 8 report that would provide the LEA with data regarding who is responding and the representativeness of the data, as well as resources related to evidence based family engagement practices.

The TFM process ensures that the Parent Survey is translated into the three highest incidence languages in each LEA. This year, those languages included Spanish, Portuguese and English. The TFM Parent Survey will also be translated based on district demographics for lower occurring translation needs, including Vietnamese and Haitian-Creole, and others as needed. These additional translations will be available upon request. LEAs participating in the TFM process use emails and other forms of notification to facilitate parental response. The breadth of the outreach and access initiatives will help to support representative sampling through the data collection process.

MA DESE will continue to use the IDC Parent Involvement Data Toolkit to aid in discussions with the Advisory Panel about the collection and analysis of demographic information, strategies for targeted outreach for specific populations, and target setting. The Panel asked to revisit the discussion in FFY 2019 to further reflect on the Toolkit's recommendations and current results.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The annual response rate is calculated by comparing the number of survey responses received compared to the number of surveys distributed families of students with IEPs served by the participating LEAs. This year's response rate is 8.4%. MA DESE recognizes that historically the response rate has been low. For FFY 2018, MA DESE reviewed representativeness in an effort to determine which families are not responding, and is developing technical assistance (TA) and resources for the LEAs to develop plans to better engage these families. MA DESE continues to work within the TFM systems to increase the response rate in an effort to increase the representativeness of the results.

The Parent Survey is intended to complement the family engagement activities and surveys that occur locally, and are comprised of statements/questions that parents rate on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) through 4 (strongly agree). The standard adopted to demonstrate "schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities" requires that each survey respondent agree or strongly agree with 50% or more of the survey items. The MA DESE Office of Planning and Research has approved the methodology for calculating results. In FFY 2018, 3205 of the 3601 respondent parents agreed or strongly agreed with at least 50% of the items, yielding an agreement rate of 89%.

MA DESE recognizes that data should be representative to provide meaningful information about family engagement. The Parent Survey administered through the TFM process was developed to include optional questions for which families could identify grade span, placement, gender and race/ethnicity. The data collected that the FFY 2018 survey responses are not representative of the statewide enrollment data of students with disabilities by race or ethnicity as shown in the charts below.

Using the TFM Parent Survey, there was one response identifying gender. While MA DESE has statewide data regarding the gender of students with an IEP, the data collected through the FFY 2018 Parent Survey does not provide reportable data.

STATE Female: 34.5 Male: 65.5 Non-Binary: Not available

LEA Female: 0.0 Male: 0.0 Non-Binary: 0.0

Using the TFM Parent Survey, the data collected regarding responses from families of students with an IEP in a specific grade span are not representative of the statewide data.

State - PreK-5: 3.02% 6-8: 23.71% 9-12: 28.31% 12+: 4.96%

LEA - PreK-5: 2.43% 6-8: 2.19% 9-12: 1.62% 12+: 0.90%

Using the TFM Parent Survey, the data collected regarding the race/ethnicity of students with an IEP indicates that the data is not representative of the state.

State - Multiracial: 3.8% Hispanic-Latino: 24.0% White: 57.9% Black-African American: 10.4% Asian: 3.6% Native American-Native Alaskan: 0.3% Native Hawaiian-Pacific Islander: 0.1%

LEA - Multiracial: 6.0% Hispanic-Latino: 10.0% White: 75.0% Black-African American: 6.0% Asian: 4.0% Native American-Native Alaskan: 1.0% Native Hawaiian-Pacific Islander: 0.0%

Using the TFM Parent Survey, the data collected regarding the placement of students with an IEP could not be analyzed. It is suspected that families completing the survey identified multiple placements. For example, the family may have identified an inclusive program as well as a substantially separated program with an explanation that their child attended inclusive classrooms for most academics but attended a separate program for an additional class. This confusion resulted in data that could not be compared to statewide data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Through the TFM process, MA DESE is introducing informational meetings for families to explain the TFM process and survey, and the importance of receiving input from families. The TFM process also provides information to the LEA administrator regarding trends and any concerns identified through the Parent Survey; this is done during administrator interviews and at the exit meeting.

MA DESE continues to support family engagement central to successful student outcomes. The priority continues to be incorporated into the MA DESE's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) focused on implementation of the Pyramid Model and Positive Solutions for Families. MA DESE has also adopted an agency-wide definition of Family Engagement and was awarded grant funding for four LEAs to participate in the research-based, nationally practiced Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) program. Additionally, MA DESE facilitates a cross-agency stakeholder group to develop a Prenatal-Grade 12 (or completion) Family Engagement Framework. To augment the implementation of this framework, MA DESE is a recipient of the Federal Grant for the Statewide Family Engagement Center to build state and local infrastructures to implement effective family engagement practice; currently in year two of five. MA DESE also works closely with the Federation for Children with Special Needs to provide training for families and LEAs regarding special education and family engagement.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Some of the actions MA DESE is taking to support greater representatives of data are as follows. MA DESE's data collection methodology for Indicator 8 is designed to support broad representation of survey respondents to promote validity and reliability in reporting. Additionally, MA DESE continues to work with the identified LEAs to make the survey available in several formats to all families of students with IEPs, aged 3 through 21, who are enrolled in the LEA. Multiple input modalities allow for responses online, through mobile devices, and as a printed survey. MA DESE activities to increase response rate include reviewing representativeness to determine which families are not responding, including any findings of trends which will be included in the final TFM exit meeting. Additionally, MA DESE will provide targeted technical assistance for the LEAs to develop plans to better support families in accessing the survey.

MA DESE is using the IDC Parent Involvement Data Toolkit to assist in the analysis of data relative to representativeness. As a result, and through discussion with the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) members, MA DESE is collecting demographic information for race/ethnicity, placement, gender and grade span. MA DESE is also working on the development of an Indicator 8 report that would provide the LEA with data regarding who is responding and the representativeness of the data as well as resources related to evidence based family engagement practices.

MA DESE will continue to use IDC Parent Involvement Data Toolkit to aid in discussions with the SEAP related to the collection and analysis of demographic information, strategies for targeted outreach for specific populations, and target setting.

8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State submitted a revised sampling plan for this indicator with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR. An evaluation of the sampling plan indicated that it could yield valid and reliable data for this indicator.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

6

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	400	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Massachusetts defines “disproportionate representation” using a calculation of weighted or alternate risk ratios and a review of the appropriateness of an LEA’s policies, practices and procedures (PPPs) for identifying students as eligible for special education services.

MA DESE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for each LEA, using a minimum cell size of 10 students with disabilities in each racial/ethnic group in every LEA. In LEAs in which there are at least 10 students with disabilities both in the racial/ethnic group, as well as the comparison group, MA DESE uses a weighted risk ratio. In cases where there are fewer than 10 students in the comparison group, MA DESE employs the alternate risk ratio. A cell of fewer than 10, though removed from the calculation, is reviewed individually to see if data irregularities for specific racial and ethnic groups in the LEA 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 or alternate risk ratios are compared to the two previous years’ weighted or alternate risk ratios. LEAs are flagged if, for three consecutive years, they exhibit a weighted or alternate risk ratio of 3.0 or greater for possible over-representation. All LEAs identified by way of this quantitative analysis are then subject to a review of the appropriateness of their policies, practices, and procedures (PPPs) for special education eligibility determination and disability identification, and communication with MA DESE about the identified disproportionate representation. If MA DESE determines the PPPs are inappropriate or otherwise inconsistent with federal and state regulations and concludes that the PPPs likely caused the disproportionate representation, then the LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification and is required to take corrective actions.

For the FFY 2018 analysis, Massachusetts used the October 1, 2018 enrollment and child count data that it collects from LEAs through its Student Information Management System (SIMS). Four hundred and six LEAs were in operation in Massachusetts in October 2018, and 400 met the State’s n size requirement for at least one racial/ethnic group. MA DESE found that two of these LEAs—a public school and a charter school—flagged by the weighted risk ratio—were flagged for overrepresentation of African American students; the charter school was additionally flagged for overrepresentation of Hispanic students. In reviewing the LEAs’ PPPs, MA DESE determined that in these two LEAs the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification and no findings of noncompliance were made.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

If an LEA displays a weighted or alternate risk ratio that exceeds 3.0 for three consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group, MA DESE follows up to review the appropriateness of the LEA’s policies, practices, and procedures. MA DESE requires the LEA to submit its policies, practices, and procedures regarding eligibility determination, along with any other data or information that may explain the pattern of disproportionate representation, including:

- LEA policies and practices regarding child find, student support teams, and special education referral and evaluation.
- Descriptions of tiered systems of support and/or other supports for struggling students in place within the LEA prior to referral for special education.
- Information regarding the LEA’s collaboration with other organizations (such as sending districts, local Early Intervention providers, etc.), if applicable.
- Information regarding any training or support that the LEA provides staff around cultural competency.

MA DESE then reviews this information to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

MA DESE reviewed the policies, practices and procedures, as described above, of the two LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. MA DESE determined for each LEA that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0			0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

42

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
9	0	364	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Massachusetts defines "disproportionate representation" using a calculation of weighted or alternate risk ratios and a review of the appropriateness of an LEA's policies, practices, and procedures (PPPs) for identifying students as eligible for special education services.

MA DESE calculates a weighted or alternate risk ratio for every LEA in each of the six required disability categories (intellectual impairments, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech/language impairments, other health impairments, autism) using a minimum cell size of 10 for each racial/ethnic disability group in every LEA. In LEAs in which there are at least 10 students with disabilities both in the racial/ethnic disability group, as well as the comparison group, MA DESE uses a weighted risk ratio. In cases where there are fewer than 10 students in the comparison group, MA DESE employs the alternate risk ratio. Cells of fewer than 10, though removed from the calculation, are reviewed individually to see if data irregularities for specific racial and ethnic groups in these LEAs would suggest disproportionate representation. 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 LEA, the weighted or alternate risk ratios are compared to the two previous years' weighted or alternate risk ratios. LEAs are flagged if, for three consecutive years, they exhibit a weighted or alternate risk ratio of 4.0 or greater for possible over-representation.

All LEAs identified by way of this quantitative analysis are then subject to a review by LEA staff and MA DESE of the appropriateness of their PPPs for special education eligibility determination and disability identification, along with any other information that may explain the pattern of disproportionate representation. If MA DESE identifies through review that the PPPs are inappropriate or otherwise inconsistent with federal and state regulations and concludes that the PPPs likely caused the disproportionate representation, then the LEA is identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification and is required to take corrective action.

For the FFY18 analysis, Massachusetts used the October 1, 2018 enrollment and child count data that it collects from LEAs through its Student Information Management System (SIMS). 406 LEAs were in operation in Massachusetts in October 2018, and 42 LEAs did not have at least 10 students with disabilities in any racial/ethnic disability group, leaving 364 LEAs that met the state's n size requirement for at least one racial/ethnic disability group.

Of the nine LEAs flagged, one is a local school district (flagged for African American students with intellectual impairments), six are charter schools (one of which was flagged for African American students with intellectual disabilities, three of which were flagged for Hispanic students with specific learning disabilities, two were flagged for Hispanic students with communication disabilities), and two were regional vocational technical school districts flagged using the alternate risk ratio for white students with other health impairments. MA DESE reviewed the policies, practices, and procedures of each of these LEAs and determined that the disproportionate representation was not the result of inappropriate identification and no findings of non-compliance were made.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

If an LEA displays a weighted or alternate risk ratio that exceeds 4.0 for three consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in any disability area, MA DESE follows up to review the appropriateness of the LEA's policies, practices, and procedures. MA DESE requires the LEA to submit its policies, practices, and procedures regarding eligibility determination, along with any other data and information that may explain the pattern of disproportionate representation, including:

- LEA policies and practices regarding child find, student support teams, and special education referral and evaluation.
- Descriptions of tiered systems of support and/or other supports for struggling students in place within the LEA prior to referral for special education.
- Information regarding the LEA's collaboration with other organizations (such as sending districts, local Early Intervention providers, etc.), if applicable.
- Information regarding any training or support that the LEA provides staff around cultural competency.

MA DESE then reviews this information to determine whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

MA DESE reviewed the policies, practices, and procedures, as described above, of the nine LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in a specific disability area. MA DESE determined for each LEA that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability areas was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

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.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2017	96.50%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.89%	99.29%	95.26%	95.83%	96.50%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,264	1,159	96.50%	100%	91.69%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

MA DESE is reporting slippage of approximately 4.81 percentage points from the compliance rate reported last year.

MA DESE attributes the overall slippage in state compliance rate to three large MA LEAs reporting significant delays. These LEAs reported data demonstrating compliance rates that ranged between 56% to 82%, respectively. Should these LEA data be removed from the calculation, the overall compliance rate for the reporting cohort would be 96.5%, which is consistent with the compliance rate identified in FFY 2017. Nearly 50% of the reasons reported for delay by these three LEAs were attributable to insufficient staff availability to complete evaluations within the 45-day timeline required by State law. The LEAs also reported scheduling conflicts as reasons contributing to delays. Of the 240 children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received in these three districts, 69 students, or 28.75%, were not timely evaluated. Of those students, almost half (40.6%) were found not eligible for services.

To address this identified noncompliance, MA DESE required the districts to create a corrective action plan to address the root causes of noncompliance. The MA DESE special education office is working with the agency's Public School Monitoring office to follow up on the implementation of the districts' corrective action plan, and to verify through analysis of additional data that the activities have addressed the root causes of noncompliance. MA DESE will require each district to submit additional data and information to verify that the district is correctly implementing the requirements for evaluation timelines. As part of this process, the State has confirmed that all individual incidences of noncompliance have been corrected for the students affected by it, insofar as all students' evaluations have been completed. MA DESE will report on the results of all corrective action activities with these districts, and with any others for which noncompliance was identified, in the anticipated clarification period in April 2019, or in the next SPP/APR reporting cycle.

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

105

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.

In FFY 2018, there were 105 students from 11 districts in the data collection cohort districts for whom initial evaluations were not completed timely within the State-established timeline of 45 days. On average, those delays exceeded the State-established timeline by 10.17 school working days. This has decreased by 2.82 days as compared to last year's average of 12.99 days. Of particular note is the difference between the mean, median, and mode for the number of working days beyond the 45-day timeline. The mean amount of days beyond the 45-day timeline, as reported above, was 10.17 days. In comparison, the median was only 5 days beyond the 45-day timeline, and the mode was one day beyond the 45-day timeline. The districts with the longest delays reported that delays resulted from insufficient staff availability.

Noncompliance is not identified for delays that were the result of circumstances over which the districts did not have control, such as school closures for weather or unanticipated emergencies, parent identified needs such as parent scheduling challenges or missing scheduled meetings, extended student absences or student illness, and extensions to evaluation timelines with agreement of the parents. Although these types of delays do not result in MA DESE finding noncompliance, these issues are addressed by MA DESE in the technical assistance the agency provides to districts that is focused on creating local systems and supports that anticipate contingencies to prevent unexpected delays.

District-related issues with scheduling and timing of evaluations are not acceptable reasons for delay and are determined to be noncompliance. Of those delays reported here, most were attributed to insufficient staff availability, the school/district having scheduling conflicts, and 45-school day timeline calculation errors.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

The State's timeline for initial evaluations is 45 school working days. See 603 CMR 28.05(1): Special Education - Education Laws and Regulations. 603 CMR 28.05: The Team Process and Development of the IEP states:

(1) Convening the Team. Within 45 school working days after receipt of a parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or reevaluation, the LEA shall: provide an evaluation; convene a Team meeting to review the evaluation data, determine whether the student requires special education and, if required, develop an IEP in accordance with state and federal laws; and provide the parents with two copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement, except that the proposal of placement may be delayed according to the provisions of 603 CMR 28.06(2)(e); or, if the Team determines that the student is not eligible for special education, the LEA shall send a written explanation of the finding that the student is not eligible. The evaluation assessments shall be completed within 30 school working days after receipt of parental consent for evaluation. Summaries of such assessments shall be completed so as to ensure their availability to parents at least two days prior to the Team meeting. If consent is received within 30 to 45 school working days before the end of the school year, the LEA shall ensure that a Team meeting is scheduled so as to allow for the provision of a proposed IEP or written notice of the finding that the student is not eligible no later than 14 days after the end of the school year.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

In FFY 2018, MA DESE has continued the process begun in FFY 2016 (and completed in FFY 2017) of phasing certain SPP/APR Indicator data collection activities (Indicators 8, 11, 12 and 13) into the Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM) review process conducted by MA DESE's Public School Monitoring Office (PSM). Please see the Introduction section for an detailed explanation of the new process and the basis for implementing it. As noted therein, the only LEA exception to this process is Boston Public Schools, for which MA DESE continues to oversee data collection on an annual basis for all Indicators.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

During the FFY 2018 data collection period, participating cohort LEAs received parental consent for initial evaluation for 1264 students. Of those evaluations, 1159, or 91.69%, were completed within the State established timeline of 45-school working days. This is a decrease of 4.14% percentage points from last year's reported compliance rate. Of all the evaluations completed, 784 students, or 62.03%, were deemed to be eligible for special education services. This is a 0.27 percentage point decrease from FFY 2017 results, and is a reasonable variation between different cohorts.

Through all verification activities, MA DESE makes sure that noncompliance corrections are made and verified as complete as soon as possible following the identification of noncompliance, and within one year after the findings were made. First, MA DESE analyzes data provided by the LEAs to ensure that for each student affected by delays in evaluation timelines, LEAs completed evaluations and determined students' eligibility, although not timely. Through this process, MA DESE verifies that each of the LEAs has corrected noncompliance for each student affected by it, unless the student is

no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA by determining that initial evaluations are completed, even if completed beyond the State's timeline. Second, MA DESE requires each LEA to engage in a root cause analysis and develop a comprehensive corrective action report as part of the procedures to ensure that each LEA is implementing the applicable regulatory requirements correctly. LEAs assess data and systems in consultation with MA DESE to identify the reasons for noncompliance and create corrective actions to amend policy or practice, and/or develop and implement appropriate systems related to the causes of noncompliance. MA DESE then reviews additional data and documentation demonstrating the LEAs' implementation of corrective action activities, and subsequent student data to determine that the LEAs are now correctly implementing the relevant regulatory requirements.

Through this process to date, MA DESE identified noncompliance in five LEAs resulting in letters of findings. The five LEAs are currently developing and implementing their comprehensive corrective action plans, and/or submitting subsequent data to the MA DESE to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements. Corrective action activities and demonstration of compliance through MA DESE's analysis of subsequent LEA data sets is on track to be completed within one year of the state's finding of noncompliance.

Current corrective action plans include LEAs:

- Resolving a software malfunction that was responsible for miscalculating the number of school days in the timeline;
- Hiring and retaining qualified staff (including team leaders, evaluators, and school psychologists);
- Contracting and outsourcing requests for translators when translators aren't available;
- Reviewing and revising LEA policies, practices, and procedures to determine root cause of the delays;
- Addressing scheduling conflicts by providing additional meeting days when staff are available for team meetings;
- Providing internal special education department professional development; and
- Reporting quarterly compilations of initial referral status, results, and outcomes.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
32	32	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In its FFY 2017 APR, MA DESE made 32 findings of noncompliance under Indicator 11. Consistent with the process described above, MA DESE required each LEA to assess the root cause(s) of noncompliance and to take corrective actions to amend policy or practice, and/or to develop and implement appropriate systems, to ensure that timelines are met and eligible students receive services timely. MA DESE verified that these activities occurred by reviewing supplemental documentation provided by the LEAs. Additionally, MA DESE examined a supplemental data set submitted by each LEA and confirmed that the LEA was reporting 100% compliance with the requirements following the implementation of corrective action activities. This process, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, ensured that corrections were made as soon as possible following the identification of noncompliance, and within one year of the noncompliance finding.

In FFY 2017, for the first time, MA DESE implemented a one-step process for correction of noncompliance. Under this process, MA DESE issued a formal letter of finding with required correction activities immediately following its identification of noncompliance. This one-step process did not allow either for MA DESE to confirm correction prior to a finding, or for an LEA to explain its data reporting, and resulted in 32 findings which were considerably more findings than MA DESE made in the past. In FFY 2018, MA DESE returned to implementing a two-step process for correction of noncompliance for Indicators 11, 12 and 13. Returning to the two-step process whereby MA DESE allows LEAs to document that they have corrected noncompliance prior to MA DESE issuing a written finding has resulted in fewer findings than reported last year.

Actions LEAs engaged in to address non-compliance include resolving a software malfunctions, hiring and retaining qualified staff (including team leaders, evaluators, and school psychologists), contracting for translators when translators aren't available, reviewing and revising LEA policies, practices, and procedures to determine root cause of the delays; addressing scheduling conflicts by providing additional meeting days when staff are available for team meetings, and providing internal special education department professional development.

LEAs corrected each finding within one year of identification, and MA DESE documented verification of correction consistent with the procedures reported above. There is no outstanding noncompliance that was first reported in FFY 2017.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The state verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected by examining corrective action reports and documentary evidence of correction, including subsequent data as appropriate. Each LEA was able to provide evidence that evaluations had been completed, albeit late, for all students affected by the noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services 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.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. 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 - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2017	92.12%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.17%	92.12%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	221
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	31
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	68

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	102
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	6
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	68	82	92.12%	100%	82.93%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Indicator 12 data collection has been implemented through MA DESE's Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM) system since FFY 2017. The only exception to this applies to Boston Public Schools for which MA DESE continues to oversee data collection on an annual basis for all Indicators. The FFY 2018 Indicator 12 data sample size is significantly smaller than that of FFY 2017. While the data shows instances of non-compliance from fewer districts, MA DESE believes that the smaller sample size contributed to the slippage of 9.22 percentage points over last year's compliance rate.

MA DESE, the MA Department of Public Health (DPH) and the MA Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) will continue to offer statewide training for Early Intervention (EI) providers and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) providers across the state on Indicator 12 data collection and reporting, and underlying transition activities. This training was offered on a limited basis in the spring of FFY 2018. This limited availability of training for LEAs, as well as known staff turnover at EI and ECSE programs, may account for some slippage in the reported compliance rate this year. The agencies will examine ways to support increased training and technical assistance next year.

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

14

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

Fourteen student records reflected delays in eligibility determination, IEP development, and/or IEP implementation beyond the child's third birthday. The table attached lists, for each record for which MA DESE identified noncompliance, the number of days following the child's third birthday that the LEA implemented the IEP, and the reason(s) for delay in implementation reported by the LEA.

MA DESE issued letters of finding to three LEAs on the basis of these 14 student records where either eligibility was not determined until after the child's third birthday and/or an IEP was not developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. Each district identified that the IEP meeting was not held before the child's third birthday due to district scheduling conflicts. Of these 14 children affected by the identified noncompliance, eight were referred to the LEA from Early Intervention (EI) less than 90 days before the third birthday. Three children, though evaluated timely, were not served because the child's parents did not consent to services, and five children were found to be not eligible for special education services. Through this process to date, LEAs with identified noncompliance are currently developing and implementing their comprehensive corrective action plans, and/or submitting subsequent data to the MA DESE to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements. Corrective action activities and demonstration of compliance through MA DESE's analysis of subsequent LEA data sets are set to be completed within one year of the state's finding of noncompliance.

Attach PDF table (optional)

Indicator 12_data_delays_FFY2018 (1)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

FFY 2018 Indicator 12 data activities were managed by the MA DESE office of Public School Monitoring as part of the Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM) review process. For Indicator 12 reporting, LEAs use a SmartForm created by MA DESE that contains the following data points: dates of referral, evaluation, IEP Team meeting, and written consent for services received, as well as information about reasons for delay, if any. For the FFY 2018 reporting period, participating LEAs were required to report data and referrals from EI, eligibility determination and IEP implementation for children turning three in January, February, and March of 2019.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Using a cycle of continuous improvement, MA DESE continues to work closely with MA DPH - the lead agency for IDEA Part C – and the MA Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) to monitor data and design appropriate improvement activities based on the needs in the State. The agencies collaborated to provide training and technical assistance using Technical Assistance Advisory SPED 2019-1: Transition from Early Intervention Programs to Early Childhood Special Education (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/2019-1ta.html>).

MA DESE continues to evaluate its own policies and procedures related to Indicator 12 to consider what additional actions are needed to decrease the number of allowable delays included in "d" of the data calculation. MA DESE will continue to offer targeted technical assistance in cooperation with DPH and EEC. Members of the Early Childhood Transition Stakeholder group are presenting the Technical Assistance Advisory at regional meetings and Early Childhood Learning Networking meetings in the 2019-2020 school year.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 2017, MA DESE determined that five LEAs did not meet compliance for 13 children for Indicator 12. The agency notified each LEA and required the LEAs to create focused Corrective Action Plans that included:

- Assessment of the LEA early childhood special education referral and evaluation data and procedures to identify the root causes of noncompliance. This included a review of local policies, practices, and procedures for transition from Part C to Part B, and consideration of what additional steps must be taken to demonstrate that, for children referred from EI, evaluations are completed and IEPs for eligible children are developed and services are implemented by the children's third birthday.
- A summary of the LEA's early childhood transition scheduling policy.
- A plan for their review of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) developed with the EI programs serving children in the LEA, including any plans for revisions or updates. The MOU was required to be jointly developed and agreed upon by each program and to outline the policies and procedures used to support smooth transition from EI (Part C) to ECSE (Part B- Section 619 under IDEA).
- Additionally, to demonstrate that the LEA practice has improved and that the LEA is able to report 100% compliance, the LEA was required to submit additional data based on the LEA size for up to 10 children referred from EI. The additional data was to include referrals where there may have been scheduling challenges. The LEA also submitted the required documentation to demonstrate that they reviewed their early childhood transition policies and practices, including the MOU between their LEA and the EI program. Additionally, each LEA was required to demonstrate that they addressed and corrected issues leading to a delay in evaluation and implementation of services for children referred from EI. Subsequent data for additional students met the 100% compliance requirement.

Examples of corrective action activities by LEAs included, but were not limited to: evidence that the LEA administration met with the IEP Team Chairs and Special Education liaisons to review requirements to develop and implement an IEP for eligible children by their third birthday; and evidence of policy development as needed to address delays in evaluation or IEP development.

The five LEAs corrected all findings within one year of identification, and MA DESE documented verification of correction for individual students affected and demonstration of compliance with relevant requirements, consistent with OSEP memorandum 09-02. There is no outstanding noncompliance from FFY 2017.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State verified that the each individual incident of noncompliance was corrected by examining the LEA's data submission including date of IEP implementation, subsequent corrective action report and documentary evidence of correction, including subsequent data as appropriate. The LEA was able to provide evidence that the each evaluation for those children affected by the noncompliance had been completed and the IEP was implemented after the receipt of the signed IEP for 12 of the children affected by the noncompliance. For the one additional child affected by the noncompliance, the district reported that the family decided not to enroll the child in the special education program.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2017	97.09%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.46%	100.00%	100.00%	99.80%	97.09%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,512	1,559	97.09%	100%	96.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

MA DESE collects Indicator 13 data through its Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM) system, through which the Indicator is integrated into districts' comprehensive self-assessment on a six-year rotating cohort cycle. Using the Massachusetts Postsecondary Transition Planning Checklist for Indicator 13, all LEAs in the cohort evaluated a representative sample of files for students aged 14-22 with IEPs. MA DESE shared data and targets for Indicator 13 with the Special Education Advisory Panel most recently at its January 2020 meeting.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 set a new baseline for Indicator 13 data, since that was the first year MA DESE began to report data for students aged 14 and up.

For FFY 2018, MA DESE issued Indicator 13 findings for eight LEAs and engaged with those LEAs in corrective activities such as those detailed below for FFY 2017. To date, MA DESE has verified correction of noncompliance and closed the findings for five of the eight, which have achieved 100 percent compliance. MA DESE will report on the compliance status of the three remaining LEAs in the FFY 2019 APR. For FFY 2018, MA DESE also identified one pre-finding correction, and this LEA has also achieved 100 percent compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
22	22	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

MA DESE required that each LEA create and implement a corrective action plan to ensure that systems would be in place to ensure 100% compliance. Through active communication to ensure oversight and through the submission of subsequent data documenting compliance, MA DESE verified that these corrective action plans were effective. LEA plans included elements such as these:

- Purchase tools to assist in developing appropriate transition goals and train staff in the use of those tools
- Hire new staff
- Enhance collaboration activities between the guidance department and special education staff
- Create a transition elective with a transition curriculum to be implemented at both high schools
- Deliver training for special educators and coordinators on student invitation
- Partner with nearby Collaborative (i.e., Educational Service Agency) to facilitate transition planning training and procedure development
- Develop a district plan for transition with measurable goals and action steps

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In each case, MA DESE required each LEA to reconvene IEP meetings for students whose records indicated noncompliance, to ensure that these students would now have 100% compliant transition planning and services. In the case of each reconvened meeting, LEAs submitted relevant documents to MA DESE, so that compliance could be verified. For example, if the Indicator 13 review indicated that the student had not been invited to their IEP meeting, the LEA submitted documentation of student invitation for the reconvened meeting. As an additional example, if the Indicator 13 review indicated that the student lacked measurable annual IEP goals related to the student's transition needs, then the LEA submitted to MA DESE the new IEP from the reconvened meeting, with compliant annual IEP goals.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., 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. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 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, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2017	Target >=	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%	51.00%	53.00%
A	50.00%	Data	42.05%	48.94%	53.83%	49.64%	50.00%
B	2017	Target >=	80.00%	82.00%	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%
B	79.37%	Data	77.00%	82.00%	81.31%	83.13%	79.37%
C	2017	Target >=	87.00%	89.00%	91.00%	93.00%	95.00%
C	87.09%	Data	88.73%	90.16%	93.74%	94.43%	87.09%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	50.20%	50.40%
Target B >=	79.60%	79.80%
Target C >=	87.30%	87.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and

compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Targets were discussed with the Special Education Advisory Panel during its April 2019 meeting, and shared again at its January 2020 meeting.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,020
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	420
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	303
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	38
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	45

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	420	1,020	50.00%	50.20%	41.18%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	723	1,020	79.37%	79.60%	70.88%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	806	1,020	87.09%	87.30%	79.02%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>MA DESE and its stakeholders are concerned that the engagement rates reported for FFY 2018 do not meet this year's targets and are also lower than the FFY 2017 engagement rates used to set the State's new baseline. As we consider these results, we acknowledge that the Indicator 14 data collection process has limited precision. Several factors affect the precision of engagement rates:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The sampling plan was designed to be statistically significant at the .95 confidence level with a plus or minus five percent margin of error. 2) It is well known that when conducting interviews for a survey, both respondent bias and interviewer bias can influence what is collected and reported. 3) Sub-populations that are under- or over-represented in the response group can cause the reported engagement rates to be higher or lower than the actual engagement rates that former students with IEPs experience. 4) Based on the response group size for Measures A, B, and C, there is a margin of error of approximately plus or minus three percent. <p>Considering all of these factors, it is possible that data reported in any given year may be higher or lower than the actual engagement rate for each of the measures by five percent or more. Engagement rates are best considered over several years/survey cycles and will be monitored moving forward. MA DESE is committed to empowering every student with a disability to succeed by providing effective education, individualized supports, and secondary transition planning and services. DESE is and will be working with stakeholders and district staff to improve the Indicator 14 data collection process statewide.</p>
B	<p>MA DESE and its stakeholders are concerned that the engagement rates reported for FFY 2018 do not meet this year's targets and are also lower than the FFY 2017 engagement rates used to set the State's new baseline. As we consider these results, we acknowledge that the Indicator 14 data collection process has limited precision. Several factors affect the precision of engagement rates:</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>1) The sampling plan was designed to be statistically significant at the .95 confidence level with a plus or minus five percent margin of error.</p> <p>2) It is well known that when conducting interviews for a survey, both respondent bias and interviewer bias can influence what is collected and reported.</p> <p>3) Sub-populations that are under- or over-represented in the response group can cause the reported engagement rates to be higher or lower than the actual engagement rates that former students with IEPs experience.</p> <p>4) Based on the response group size for Measures A, B, and C, there is a margin of error of approximately plus or minus three percent.</p> <p>Considering all of these factors, it is possible that data reported in any given year may be higher or lower than the actual engagement rate for each of the measures by five percent or more. Engagement rates are best considered over several years/survey cycles and will be monitored moving forward. MA DESE is committed to empowering every student with a disability to succeed by providing effective education, individualized supports, and secondary transition planning and services. DESE is and will be working with stakeholders and district staff to improve the Indicator 14 data collection process statewide.</p>
C	<p>MA DESE and its stakeholders are concerned that the engagement rates reported for FFY 2018 do not meet this year's targets and are also lower than the FFY 2017 engagement rates used to set the State's new baseline. As we consider these results, we acknowledge that the Indicator 14 data collection process has limited precision. Several factors affect the precision of engagement rates:</p> <p>1) The sampling plan was designed to be statistically significant at the .95 confidence level with a plus or minus five percent margin of error.</p> <p>2) It is well known that when conducting interviews for a survey, both respondent bias and interviewer bias can influence what is collected and reported.</p> <p>3) Sub-populations that are under- or over-represented in the response group can cause the reported engagement rates to be higher or lower than the actual engagement rates that former students with IEPs experience.</p> <p>4) Based on the response group size for Measures A, B, and C, there is a margin of error of approximately plus or minus three percent.</p> <p>Considering all of these factors, it is possible that data reported in any given year may be higher or lower than the actual engagement rate for each of the measures by five percent or more. Engagement rates are best considered over several years/survey cycles and will be monitored moving forward. MA DESE is committed to empowering every student with a disability to succeed by providing effective education, individualized supports, and secondary transition planning and services. DESE is and will be working with stakeholders and district staff to improve the Indicator 14 data collection process statewide.</p>

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., 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. This includes military employment.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

For FFY 2018, MA DESE continued to use the OSEP-approved cohort sampling method, to yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	FFY2018 Indicator 14 Survey

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The Response Calculator is a tool designed by the National Post-School Outcomes Center so that states can input key demographic data on the Respondent and Target Leaver Groups. The Response Calculator compares proportions between the two groups on demographic variables and identifies where important differences exist between the two groups on those variables. The demographic variable categories are: Specific Learning Disability (LD), Emotional Disability (ED), Intellectual Disability (ID), All Other disability groups (AO), Gender, Minority, English Language Learners (ELL), Dropout. Of the eight demographic characteristics analyzed, only one is underrepresented by more than 3.00%: Dropout (-7.77%). This underrepresentation suggests that the engagement rates reported may be slightly higher than they would have been if former students who dropped out had been proportionately interviewed rather than being underrepresented.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Although MA DESE asks districts to collect up-to-date contact information to be used during the survey process during the school year they are expected to complete/leave school, it is often impossible to collect up-to-date contact information when students choose to drop out. Additionally those who drop out tend to refuse to be interviewed more often than other former students. To help remedy the under-representation of former students who dropped out, MA DESE will emphasize to districts the importance of collecting up-to-date contact information for all students identified as at-risk each year. MA DESE will also encourage districts to work with their dropout prevention centers to seek contact information from former students and to help with surveying those who decline to re-engage with the school system.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2018, MA DESE implemented a new redundant system to double-check that school districts were contacting the correct exiters. In past years, school district staff developed their own list of former students with IEPs to be contacted and interviewed for the Indicator 14 survey. This year, DESE generated a master list of 2017-2018 exiters using the state's Student Information Management System (SIMS). Each district then received a SIMS list of their exiters to check against the district list, to ensure accuracy. A small number of discrepancies were discovered and resolved, enabling improved survey tracking and data analysis.

MA DESE also improved the data collection system by instituting a new online survey that was more user-friendly to exiters and district staff than the previous paper-only version. In the past, each exiter's survey responses were recorded on print forms and then entered into an Excel form that was delivered securely to MA DESE by the end of September. For FFY 2018, MA DESE made the Indicator 14 survey available online so that it could be completed by either school staff or the exiters themselves. Once the online survey opened, MA DESE's Indicator 14 contractor, the Potsdam Institute for Applied Research (PIAR), provided continuous data to MA DESE on which districts were actively completing the survey and the total numbers of completed surveys from each district. PIAR also informed each district of its own totals and sent Indicator 14 reminders to each district that had not yet completed any surveys. MA DESE also sent reminders to districts, via email and telephone. For the majority of the survey period, PIAR's updates occurred once every two weeks. For the last month before the data collection deadline, this was accelerated to once per week.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The State revised its targets for FFY 2018 and provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: 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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	24
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	17

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	48.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	48.00% - 58.00%	48.00% - 58.00%	48.00% - 58.00%	48.00% - 58.00%	48.00% - 58.00%
Data	25.00%	42.11%	41.67%	57.14%	53.85%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	48.00%	75.00%	48.00%	75.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
17	24	53.85%	48.00%	75.00%	70.83%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

MA DESE exceeded its own originally expected range of performance (48% to 58%) and has, therefore, following discussion with the Special Education Advisory Panel, adjusted the target at the high end (48% to 71%) of its expected range in order to acknowledge the increase over time in the reported number of resolution sessions that result in settlement agreements.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State revised its targets for FFY 2018 and provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	613
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	10
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	498

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

MA DESE works closely with stakeholders on developing SPP targets and setting priorities for improvement in each of the substantive areas reported in the SPP. As identified in previous years' SPP/APR reports, until school year 2018-2019, MA DESE facilitated two advisory panels, known as the Special Education Advisory Council and the Statewide Special Education Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was comprised of members of the Special Education Advisory Council to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (formed under M.G.L. c. 15, § 1G), as well as representatives of other entities articulated in IDEA Part B (34 CFR § 300.167), inclusive of representatives of state agencies with which the SEA and LEAs work to support children and families (e.g., the Departments of Early Education and Care, Public Health, Developmental Disability Services, Mental Health, Children & Families, Youth Services, Transitional Assistance, and the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission), parents of students with disabilities and representatives of parent serving agencies including the federally funded Parent Training and Information Center; individuals with disabilities; special and general educators and service providers from public school districts, charter schools, approved private special education schools, and educational collaboratives; representatives of higher education; and health care and related service providers.

Since the inception of the SPP, the Steering Committee's primary focus was the annual review of the SPP/APR targets and activities. At an annual meeting facilitated by MA DESE, the Committee reviewed the state's progress toward meeting targets and discussed statewide improvement activities and strategic plans for supporting improved performance and outcomes for students with IEPs. The Advisory Council engaged in a broader approach to discussing policy priorities and advising on the unmet needs in the area of special education and met multiple times throughout the year.

In order to better support a unified approach to stakeholder engagement and coordination of the advisory bodies mandated by MA DESE consistent with state and federal laws, MA DESE merged these entities into a single state advisory panel in 2018. Now, a single Special Education Advisory Panel meets up to five times each school year to review data, discuss policy priorities, and identify unmet needs in the area of special education consistent with state law and IDEA Part B. At each meeting the group addresses various aspects of the SPP/APR and the State's general supervision systems, as well as relevant policy matters. MA DESE facilitates discussion of baseline and current data, longitudinal targets, historical rates of performance and compliance and the trajectory for improvement for each of the indicators, and the effectiveness of focused improvement activities within the context of the state's Results Driven Accountability framework. The Panel met most recently in January 2020 to review current data and targets, and to set extended targets through FFY 2019 for those indicators for which extended targets had not yet been set. These targets are included in this year's report.

As needed, MA DESE also convenes stakeholder working groups throughout the year to provide focused input on specific projects and policy priorities. Examples of these focused groups include a Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) leadership team and working group, a family engagement

workgroup, and a secondary transition stakeholder group. MA DESE also consults with educators, parents, advocates, and others on an ad hoc basis to inform policy and practice. Stakeholder engagement is an essential component of MA DESE's special education agenda.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	83.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	77.00% - 87.00%	77.00% - 87.00%	77.00% - 87.00%	77.00% - 87.00%	77.00% - 87.00%
Data	83.72%	84.35%	86.49%	82.85%	85.29%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	77.00%	87.00%	77.00%	87.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10	498	613	85.29%	77.00%	87.00%	82.87%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Massachusetts continues to report high rates of mediation agreements reached. At its January 2020 meeting, the Special Education Advisory Panel endorsed maintaining the target range established by the state in FFY 2011.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Teri Williams Valentine

Title:

Director of Special Education Planning & Policy

Email:

Teri.W.Valentine@mass.gov

Phone:

781-338-6202

Submitted on:

04/30/20 12:31:55 PM