

OVERVIEW TO STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN DEVELOPMENT

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has developed its State Performance Plan (SPP) with input from stakeholders and with the expectation that the SPP will be disseminated to the public. The SPP will be available on the VDOE web site, and will be disseminated to all school divisions in the state, to members of the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), and to all local advisory committees (LACs). The SPP will also be made to available to various media, consistent with VDOE dissemination of other material.

The requirement to obtain broad stakeholder input was met through a meeting with stakeholders. The focus of the stakeholder meeting was to review the State Performance Plan requirements, discussion of each indicator with an emphasis on the overview of issues/description of systems or processes, discussion of baseline data and development of targets. Stakeholders included representatives of the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school division superintendents, school division directors of special education, other state agencies, the Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center (PEATC), Training/Technical Assistance Centers (T/TACs), early childhood specialists, transition specialists and VDOE staff. It is expected that additional individuals will be added to the stakeholder committee, including elementary and secondary principals, assessment specialists, and other persons as the need is identified.

The Stakeholders will be organized into six work groups that will assist with the development of the Annual Performance Plans. VDOE staff will coordinate the activities for each workgroup. Workgroups will be responsible for analyzing data collected by VDOE and will determine whether progress or slippage can be measured for each indicator. Workgroups will also make suggestions for revisions to targets and improvement activities/timelines/resources as needed. The six workgroups are: (1) Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment (FAPE in the LRE) (indicators 4, 5, 9 and 10); (2) Early Childhood Education (indicators 6, 7 and 12); (3) Secondary Education and Transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 and 14); (4) General Supervision (indicators 11, 15 and 20); (5) Dispute Resolution (indicators 8, 16, 17, 18 and 19) and (6) Assessment (indicator 3).

Following the submission of the Annual Performance Report in February 2007, VDOE expects to report to the public on the progress or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP. Additionally, VDOE will report to the public on the performance of each local educational agency located in the state on the targets in the SPP.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Indicator 1 –

Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

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

Data Source:

VDOE end of year report by school divisions.

Measurement:

Measurement for youth with IEPs is the same measurement as for all youth.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE) School completion options available to students with disabilities in Virginia are specified in the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia (8 VAC 20-131-10)* adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in July 2000. Program completion options available to students with disabilities are the Advanced Studies Diploma, Standard Diploma, Modified Standard Diploma, Special Diploma, Certificate of Program Completion, and the General Achievement Diploma.

The Advanced Studies, Standard, and Modified Standard Diplomas have specific course content requirements that align with the state's Standards of Learning (SOL). The Modified Standard Diploma program is intended for certain students with disabilities who are unlikely to meet all of the requirements for a Standard Diploma. Eligibility for and participation in the Modified Standard Diploma program is determined by the student's Individual Education Program (IEP) team and the student, where appropriate, at any point after the student's eighth grade year. The requirements for earning this diploma include 20 standard units of credit and passing numeracy and literacy assessments prescribed by the Board of Education.

The Special Diploma is awarded to certain students with disabilities who complete the requirements of their Individualized Education Program (IEP) and do not meet the requirements for other diplomas.

In accordance with this indicator, VDOE does not include students who earned a Modified Standard or a Special Diploma in calculating the graduation rate.

Information on the Standards of Accreditation and requirements for diploma types can be found at:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Accountability/soa.html> , in Superintendent's Informational Memorandum Number 123, August 1, 2003 available at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/suptsmemos/2003/inf123.html> and in

Virginia’s Consolidated State Application and Accountability Workbook, Revised August 2005, available at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/#csa> .

Analysis of previous years’ data shows the graduation rate for students with disabilities is less than the graduation rate for all students. The graduation rate for students with disabilities decreased slightly from 2003 to 2004 while the graduation rate for all students also decreased slightly from 2003 to 2004.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For the 2004-2005 school year, the graduation rate for students with disabilities was 51.5 percent. The graduation rate for all students was 90.3 percent.

For the 2003-2004 school year, the graduation rate for students with disabilities was 52.6 percent. This graduation rate for all students was 90.5 percent.

2003-04 Graduation Rate		2004-05 Graduation Rate	
Students with Disabilities	All Students	Students with Disabilities	All Students
52.6%	90.5%	51.5%	90.3%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The graduation rate for all students is calculated by identifying the number of students receiving an advanced studies diploma or a standard diploma divided by the number of all students receiving diplomas (total number of advanced studies diplomas, standard diplomas, modified standard diplomas, special diplomas, certificates of attendance, and General Education Development (GED) Certificates). The graduation rate for students with disabilities is calculated by identifying the number of students with disabilities receiving an advanced studies diploma or a standard diploma divided by the number of all students with disabilities receiving diplomas (total number of advanced studies diplomas, standard diplomas, modified standard diplomas, special diplomas, certificates of attendance, and General Education Development (GED) Certificates).

*** For the 2005-2006 school year, VDOE will be able to determine a graduation rate with a percentage of graduates based on ninth grade membership. VDOE has not had prior years’ membership data for students with disabilities and so was not able to use this calculation for the 2004-2005 school year. Future years’ data will be reported consistent with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements.

The following chart displays totals for all diploma types available to students with disabilities in Virginia. VDOE feels these data more accurately depict the graduation status for students with disabilities in Virginia.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Students with Disabilities Completing School Ages 14-22+		
High School Completion Type	2003-2004	2004-05
Advanced Studies Diploma	640 (7%)	620 (7%)
Standard Diploma	3862 (42%)	3949 (42%)
Modified Standard Diploma	1435 (16%)	1700 (18%)
Special Diploma	2620 (29%)	2583 (27%)
Certificate of Program Completion	568 (6%)	646 (6%)
General Education Development (GED) Certificate	1 (<1%)	11 (<1%)
TOTAL	9126	9509

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	55% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school will receive an advanced studies or standard diploma.
2006 (2006-2007)	58% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school will receive an advanced studies or standard diploma. ***VDOE will be able to determine a state graduation rate described in the overview section, based on calculation of 9 th grade cohort group. It is possible projected targets may be revised based on this calculation.
2007 (2007-2008)	61% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school will receive an advanced studies or standard diploma. ***There will be new math graduation requirements in effect for the first time for the 2007-2008 school year. These requirements will impact students with and without disabilities and could require VDOE to revise graduation rate targets again.
2008 (2008-2009)	64% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school will receive an advanced studies or standard diploma.
2009 (2009-2010)	67% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school will receive an advanced studies or standard diploma.
2010 (2010-2011)	70% of youth with IEPs graduating from high school will receive an advanced studies or standard diploma.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Provide online practice assessments and tutorials designed to help students prepare for SOL assessments.

Provide tutorials for students who need additional preparation for retakes of the SOL tests needed for high school verified course credits.

Provide credit calculator tool that allow the school personnel, students, and parents to determine the standard and verified credits needed to obtain a diploma.

Support local graduation academies to prepare rising seniors in need of verified units of credit.

Support and provide consultants with expertise in special education in the academic review process who visit and assist schools identified as needing improvement.

Provide reading training and technical assistance with a focus on needs of special education teachers, linking with Virginia's *Reading First* project by supporting staff development for special educators across all grade levels, including middle and high school.

Provide a Web-based application that assesses the mathematics competencies from fourth to ninth grades to assist with local remediation programs.

Provide SOL resources that assist elementary, middle, and high school teachers in the delivery of SOL content to students using differentiated instructional techniques and technology and make available at www.ttaonline.org

Maintain coordinated support for elementary and middle school sites for implementing the Instruction Support Team (IST) model in each of the 8 regions of the state, to enhance, improve, and increase instruction and learning.

Establish coordinated, statewide training to improving literacy for students with disabilities that will enable them to be successful in learning the SOL content. Target middle and high school teachers in high need schools to be trained in the University of Kansas Strategic Instruction Model (SIM). Provide support for pilot demonstration schools to implement the Content Literacy Continuum Strategic Instruction Model (SIM-CLC).

Provide staff development and support for service providers of students with disabilities who are incarcerated in adult local and regional jails.

Provide for training and technical assistance on the use of Effective School-wide Discipline based on positive behavior support research.

Coordinate information and training for personnel in schools serving children with autism spectrum disorders.

Provide support, coordination, and technical assistance for the following activities to improve secondary transition:

- Continue participation in Transition Outcomes Project which provides a system for school divisions to track IEPs and use data to improve transition services.
- Conduct annual statewide transition conference
- Support regional Transition Capacity Building Project that provides support and technical assistance for strategic planning, program evaluation, and sharing of resources on a regional basis.
- Continue to support the Postsecondary Education Rehabilitation Transition Program (PERT), a statewide collaborative between Virginia's education and rehabilitation agencies and local school divisions to support transition assessments for students.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____Virginia_____
State

- Provide scholarships for students with disabilities to participate in the Youth Leadership Forum sponsored by the Virginia Board for People with Disabilities.
- Continue to participate in the National Transition Community of Practice.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include VDOE staff, TTAC staff and others listed in the activity description.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2 –

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

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

Data Source:

VDOE's end-of-the year school division data collection is the source for these data.

Measurement:

The measurement for the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school is the same as that for all youth. The yearly dropout rate for all students and for students with disabilities is defined as:

- (i) the number of dropouts for a given school year; divided by
- (ii) the September 30th membership of that school year.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) defines dropout as an individual in grades 7-12 who was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled on October 1 of the current school year, or was not enrolled on October 1 of the previous school year although expected to be in the membership, has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district approved educational program and does not meet any of the exclusionary conditions: transfer to another public school district, private school or state or district approved education program, temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension, illness or death.

This definition is used for the calculation in determining the dropout rate for all students. Previous years' data analyses have shown that students with disabilities drop out of school at a higher rate compared to the drop out rate for all students. Previous years' rates have been determined using different methods for calculation but all have shown the same general results. The method described above will be used by VDOE until a national calculation has been approved for all states to use.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For the 2004-2005 school year, school divisions reported 10,297 students dropping out, for grades 7-12. The total membership for all students for grades 7-12 was 557,795.

For the 2004-2005 school year, school divisions reported 1,501 students with disabilities dropping out, for grades 7-12. The total membership for students with disabilities for grades 7-12 was 76,475.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For the 2004-2005 school year, the drop out rate for all students, grades 7-12, is calculated as the total number of students reported as dropped out for that year divided by the total number of students reported in grades 7-12. The rate for all students was 1.85 %.

For the 2004-2005 school year, the drop out rate for students with disabilities, grades 7-12, is calculated as the total number of students with disabilities reported as dropped out for that year divided by the total number of students with disabilities, grades 7-12. The rate for students with disabilities was 1.96 %.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	The drop out rate for students with disabilities will decrease to 1.93 percent.
2006 (2006-2007)	The drop out rate for students with disabilities will decrease to 1.91 percent.
2007 (2007-2008)	The drop out rate for students with disabilities will decrease to 1.89 percent.
2008 (2008-2009)	The drop out rate for students with disabilities will decrease to 1.87 percent.
2009 (2009-2010)	The drop out rate for students with disabilities will decrease to 1.85 percent.
2010 (2010-2011)	The drop out rate for students with disabilities will decrease to 1.83 percent.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Provide training and technical assistance to school divisions on instructional based assessment and curriculum based measurement and develop an evaluation guide for assessment services.

Continue cultural competency training.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Continue implementation of transition outcome project and other transition projects.

Continue with Instructional Support Team initiative to develop school programs for improving and increasing student performance through early intervention with students experiencing problems.

Provide reading training and technical assistance with a focus on needs of special education teachers, linking with Virginia's *Reading First* project.

Provide leadership, coordination, and support to personnel who provide special education to students with disabilities who are incarcerated in local and regional jails, with an emphasis on effective literacy instruction and transition.

Timeline for all activities are for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include VDOE staff, TTAC staff and federal technical assistance offices.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

Indicator 3 –

Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

Data Source: Virginia Department of Education Information Management Office.

In 2004-05 no unique student test identifier (ID) was used, therefore the data set is the number of assessments (or tests) taken by students with disabilities.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of districts meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total # of districts in the State times 100.
- B. Participation rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
 - b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
 - c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
 - d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
 - e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

- C. Proficiency rate =
 - a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed
 - b.# of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
 - c.# of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
 - d.# of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a

times 100); and
 e. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).
 Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Measurement for youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) on assessment performance is the same measurement as for all youth for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for schools and school divisions under the *No Child Left Behind Act*. In 2004-2005 there were no unique student testing identifiers, therefore the data represent the number of individual assessments taken by students with disabilities rather than the number of students. Unique student testing identifiers are now being utilized, as of the 2005-2006 fall test administration of Standards of Learning (SOL) assessment. Also, AYP calculations include only first-time test takers and test answer sheets are coded to show if the test is “retest” or “recovery.”

Virginia’s annual measurable objectives for students with disabilities are consistent with those for all students as described in Virginia’s Accountability Workbook. The Accountability Workbook may be accessed at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/nclb/#csa>.

In 2004-2005 Virginia administered English/reading and mathematics assessments to students in grades 3, 5, 8, and certain high school courses (End-of-Course tests). Beginning 2005-2006, Virginia will administer state assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and End-of-Course tests as required under the *No Child Left Behind Act*.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A. Percent of Districts Meeting AYP Objectives:

The addition of proxy percentages was used in calculating AYP. The percentages (14 percent for reading and 17 percent for mathematics) represent students with disabilities who demonstrate proficiency on modified achievement standards and were added to the subgroup’s pass rates under interim flexibility for states announced in May 2005 by United States Secretary of Education.

62.8 percent (83 of 132) of Virginia’s public school divisions met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup.

A. State Assessment Participation:

Assessment Subject Area	Number of Tests Taken	Number of Tests Expected Tests to be Taken*	Percent
Reading	49,271	50,320	97.9
Mathematics	59,690	60,749	98.3

* Students enrolled in grades and courses for which there are state assessments are documented by coding on the test answer sheets. These data represent the number of test answer sheets that are reported as the student did not attempt the test.

B. State Assessment Proficiency: The data set is the number of tests taken by students with disabilities.

Test Type	Number of Tests Passed (Advanced Proficient + Proficient)	Number of Tests Failed	Total Number of Tests	Percent Tests Passed
Regular Assessment No Accommodations	63,960	26,858	90,818	70.4
Regular Assessment With Accommodations	276,102	283,510	559,612	49.3
Alternative Assessment Against Grade-Level Standards No Accommodations (Virginia Grade Level Alternative + Virginia Substitute Evaluation Program*)	1,502	517	2019	74.4
Alternative Assessment Against Grade-Level Standards With Accommodations	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>
Alternate Assessment Against Alternate Achievement Standards No Accommodations (Virginia Alternate Assessment Program)	14,856	534	15,390	96.5
Alternate Assessment Against Alternate Achievement Standards With Accommodations	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>	<i>No data</i>

*The total number of participants in the VSEP was below 10 and considered statistically insignificant for reporting purposes.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data from 2004-2005 provide the percentage of students who participated in Virginia’s Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments for English/Reading and mathematics in grades 3, 5, 8 and high school courses. The overall percentage for state assessment participation is 97.9 for reading and 98.3 for mathematics.

The overall pass rate of students with disabilities on the regular assessment with no accommodations was 70.4 percent; with accommodations was 49.3 percent. The pass rate on alternative assessments against grade-level standards was 74.4 percent.

The pass rate on alternate assessments against alternate achievement standards was 96.5 percent. It is important to note that the 2004-2005 was the last year using the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) that has been in place. The VAAP was revised in 2005 to reflect student achievement on Aligned Standards of Learning and adjusted to the need for testing and scoring entries at more grade levels as required by the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Therefore, the 2004-2005 VAAP data will not be an accurate representation of baseline data against which future years will be compared.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>At least 64 percent of Virginia’s school divisions will meet AYP objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup. At least 95% of students with disabilities will participate in state assessments. At least 69% of students with disabilities will pass state english/reading assessments. At least 67% of students with disabilities will pass state mathematics assessments.</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>At least 65 percent of Virginia’s school divisions will meet AYP objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup. At least 95% of students with disabilities will participate in state assessments. At least 73% of students with disabilities will pass state english/reading assessments. At least 71% of students with disabilities will pass state mathematics assessments.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>At least 66 percent of Virginia’s school divisions will meet AYP objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup. At least 95% of students with disabilities will participate in state assessments. At least 77% of students with disabilities will pass state english/reading assessments. At least 75% of students with disabilities will pass state mathematics assessments.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>At least 67 percent of Virginia’s school divisions will meet AYP objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup. At least 95% of students with disabilities will participate in state assessments. At least 81% of students with disabilities will pass state english/reading assessments. At least 79% of students with disabilities will pass state mathematics assessments.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>At least 68 percent of Virginia’s school divisions will meet AYP objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup. At least 95% of students with disabilities will participate in state assessments. At least 85% of students with disabilities will pass state english/reading assessments. At least 83% of students with disabilities will pass state mathematics assessments.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>At least 69 percent of Virginia’s school divisions will meet AYP objectives for the students with disabilities subgroup. At least 95% of students with disabilities will participate in state assessments. At least 89% of students with disabilities will pass state english/reading assessments. At least 87% of students with disabilities will pass state mathematics assessments.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Support and provide academic reviewers with expertise in special education in the Academic Review Process to assist schools in most need of improving results

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Provide reading training and technical assistance with a focus on needs of special education teachers, linking with Virginia's *Reading First* project

Provide instructional resources that will assist elementary, middle, and high school teachers in the delivery of SOL content to students using differentiated instructional techniques and technology and make available at www.ttaonline.org

Maintain coordinated support and establish middle school sites for implementing the Instruction Support Team (IST) model in each of the 8 regions, to enhance, improve, and increase instruction and learning
Support the use of Recordings for the Blind & Dyslexic as assistive technology for students in localities with high need

Provide coordinated training and technical assistance on the need for and use of assistive technology (AT) with a focus on access to the general curriculum and support for including students with disabilities in general classrooms and community settings and make available at www.ttaonline.org

Establish coordinated, statewide training to improve literacy for students with disabilities that will enable them to be successful in learning the SOL content. Target middle and high school teachers in high need schools to be trained in the University of Kansas Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) and provide state support for pilot demonstration schools to implement the Strategic Instruction Model -Content Literacy Continuum (SIM-CLC)

Provide coordinated information and training for personnel in schools to build their capacity to improve services and outcomes for children with autism through regional training of trainers program

Provide training and technical assistance for personnel working with preschool age children in addressing inclusive preschool placements, communication, behavior and pre literacy and numeracy skills at regional workshops and statewide conferences

Provide searchable database of local school division and state operated program improvement activities reported on their local improvement plans and make available at www.ttaonline.org

Develop and/or revise guidance material for effective practices, including: services for students with speech-language disabilities and hearing impairments; use of standards-driven process for the Individualized Education Program, use of restraint and seclusion in public schools, and special education referral for students with limited English proficiency

Provide leadership, coordination, and support for personnel who provide special education to students with disabilities who are incarcerated in local and regional jails, with an emphasis on effective literacy instruction and transition.

Continue providing leadership and support for the special education Training/Technical Assistance Center system (T/TAC), the Hearing Impairment Center, and the Virginia Department for Blind and Vision Impaired to provide technical assistance and research-based effective practices dissemination on behalf of infants, toddlers, and youth with disabilities

Examine special education service delivery and caseload standards for revision.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include VDOE staff, TTAC staff and others listed in the activity description.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4 – 4.B. is a new indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

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

Data Source:

Table 5, Section A, *Report of Children with Disabilities Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days* of the Annual Report of Children Served.

Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing rates for children with disabilities to rates for nondisabled within a district or by comparing among LEAs for children with disabilities in the State.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by # of districts in the State times 100.
- B. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE) analysis of the data over a three year period beginning in 2001-2002 reveals students with disabilities receive long-term suspensions and expulsions at a rate higher than that for students without disabilities. Analysis of the suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities and students without disabilities since 2001-2002 reveals that the disparity between the rates has remained over the three-year period. Expulsion rates for students with disabilities and without disabilities increased in 2003-04 but the disparity between the two rates remained virtually the same. A more detailed analysis of previous year' data reveals there are relatively few school divisions that have greater than 3 long-term out of school suspensions or greater than 3 expulsions.

In any case, VDOE ensures school divisions comply with the continued service provisions of the IDEA.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): (see discussion of baseline data)**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Using 2004-2005 data, a preliminary analysis of special education and general education long-term suspensions and expulsions has been completed. When the numbers of special education student long term suspensions per 1,000 students were compared to the long-term suspension rates per 1,000 students for regular education for each division, 50 of 132 school divisions had rates for special education students that exceeded those for regular education students. However, when only those school divisions with four or more long-term suspensions for students with disabilities were included, the number dropped to 30. Comparison of regular education and general education rates of long-term suspensions within a school division with a low number of suspensions can skew the data and has the potential to misrepresent the identification of schools with "significant discrepancies." To further refine the analysis, a comparison of rates of suspensions of the 30 school divisions having four or more suspensions with the state average rate of suspensions per 1,000 students of 6.16 was made. Of the 30, only 18 school divisions had rates of suspensions for children with disabilities that exceeded those for the state as a whole, for a percentage of 13.6 percent. Using this analysis, Virginia will identify school divisions with "significant discrepancy" as those divisions whose rate of long-term suspension exceeds that for students without disabilities, and is greater than the state average and has a number of long-term suspensions greater than three.

A similar analysis was completed for expulsion data. Forty-one school divisions had expulsion rates per 1,000 students for special education students that exceeded rates for general education students. However, when only those school divisions with four or more expulsions were counted, only 13 school divisions were identified. When comparison with the state rate of 1.24 per 1,000 students was made, 12 of the 13 school divisions were identified as exceeding the state rate, for a percentage of 9 percent. Using this analysis, Virginia will identify school divisions with "significant discrepancy" as those divisions whose rate of expulsion exceeds that for students without disabilities, and is greater than the state average and has a number of expulsions greater than three.

By using this type of procedure to examine the data, a definition of "significant discrepancy" can be developed. Expulsion and suspension data will be analyzed in aggregate and also disaggregated by race and ethnicity to compare rates between the population of students without disabilities and those with disabilities. Based on the analysis of the data, "ranges of acceptance" will be developed that address the minimum number of actual suspensions or expulsions that would serve as a cut off point for school division inclusion in the analysis and the variance from the state average that would indicate identification. School divisions that have actual numbers of suspensions and expulsions that exceed a minimum and expulsion and suspension rates for disabled students beyond the ranges of acceptance for both the state comparison and the comparison within school divisions will be identified. Once an analysis of data using a significant discrepancy has been completed, it is likely that new targets will be developed. Identification will be made on both an aggregate basis (Part A) and by race/ethnicity (Part B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Reduce the percentage of LEAs with significant discrepancy for long-term suspensions to 12 percent and for expulsions to 8 percent.
2006 (2006-2007)	Reduce the percentage of LEAs with significant discrepancy for long-term suspensions to 12 percent and for expulsions to 8 percent.
2007 (2007-2008)	Reduce the percentage of LEAs with significant discrepancy for long-term suspensions to 12 percent and for expulsions to 8 percent.
2008 (2008-2009)	Reduce the percentage of LEAs with significant discrepancy for long-term suspensions to 12 percent and for expulsions to 8 percent.
2009 (2009-2010)	Reduce the percentage of LEAs with significant discrepancy for long-term suspensions to 12 percent and for expulsions to 8 percent.
2010 (2010-2011)	Reduce the percentage of LEAs with significant discrepancy for long-term suspensions to 10 percent and for expulsions to 7 percent.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Identify LEAs with significant discrepancy for long-term suspension or expulsion. Focus on these divisions and follow-up through with notification and require explanation of local efforts to deal with suspension/expulsion. This follow-up will include review of local policies and procedures and revision of these policies and procedures where needed.

Continue to provide training to school divisions on manifestation review procedures.

Continue to provide training in effective school-wide discipline using positive behavior interventions. Including dissemination of Functional Behavioral Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plan multimedia materials.

Analyze state and division level data to identify areas with the largest difference in suspension and expulsion rates for children with disabilities and children without disabilities. Provide technical follow-up.

Continue to provide training to reduce disproportionate representation, to include cultural competency training.

Establish a statewide committee to work with VDOE staff on the development of technical assistance for addressing disproportionate representation.

Continue to provide training to school divisions on the analysis of violence, crime and discipline data through the "Prevention through Information" project.

Develop guidelines for parents for understanding the student discipline section of the Code of Virginia.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include VDOE staff, TTAC staff and others listed in the activity description.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5 –

Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;¹
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

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

Measurement:**Data Source:**

Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served).

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- C. Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) collected data on the amount of time students receive special education outside the regular class on the December 1, 2004 Child Count. Previous years' data reflected the amount of time students received special education services but did not specify where the services were provided, so no year to year comparison is possible. Data were reported that way because percent of time receiving special education data are used to generate state funding to school divisions in Virginia.

Data reported in the public residential facilities category are for students placed in public educational programs in facilities operated by the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services and Virginia's two state schools for the Deaf and Blind and Multi-disabled.

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Placements for Students with Disabilities, Ages 6-21		
Placement Settings	2004-05	
Amount Spec Ed Outside Reg Class 0-20 %	88,120	56 %
Amount Spec Ed Outside Reg Class 21-60 %	40,654	26 %
Amount Spec Ed Outside Reg Class 61-100 %	22,761	15 %
Public Separate Facility	2,230	1 %
Private Day Program	1,734	1 %
Public Residential	249	< 1 %
Private Residential	714	< 1 %
Home-Based	946	< 1 %
Hospital	13	< 1 %
TOTAL	157,421	

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data for students with disabilities reflecting the amount of special education received outside the regular class (the amount of special education received in a special education class) were collected with the December 1, 2004 child count. Collections for future years will allow for a comparison to previous years data and will allow for measurement of progress or slippage on the targets listed below.

As indicated in the chart above, data reported in the December 1, 2004 child count show 56 percent of students with disabilities received less than 21 percent of their special education outside the regular classroom; 26 percent received between 21 and 60 percent of their special education outside the regular classroom; and 15 percent received between 61 and 100 percent of their special education outside the regular classroom. All other placement categories reflect either 1 percent or less than 1 percent.

In addition to determining percentages for aggregated state data, for future years VDOE will include an analysis of data to determine which school divisions fail to meet the state average for percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving less than 21 percent of their special education services outside the regular class. Information obtained from this analysis will be used for follow-up activities and will be used as part of VDOE's on-site monitoring process.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>Increase the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving less than 21 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 58%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving more than 60 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 14%</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving their special education services in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements to 3 percent.</p>

SPP Template – Part B (3)

<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving less than 21 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 60%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving more than 60 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 12%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving their special education services in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements to 2 percent.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving less than 21 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 62%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving more than 60 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 11%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving their special education services in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements to 1 percent.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving less than 21 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 64%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving more than 60 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 10%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving their special education services in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements to less than 1 percent.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving less than 21 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 66%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving more than 60 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 9%.</p> <p>Maintain the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving their special education services in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements to less than 1 percent. Identify school divisions where students placed by those divisions in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements could be reduced.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>Increase the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving less than 21 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 68%.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving more than 60 percent of their special education services outside the regular class to 8%.</p> <p>Maintain the percentage of students, ages 6-21, receiving their special education services in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements to less than 1 percent. Identify school divisions where students placed by those divisions in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements could be reduced.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Support and provide academic reviewers with expertise in special education in the academic review Process

Provide information to assist elementary, middle, and high school teachers in the delivery of Standards Of Learning (SOL) content to students using differentiated instructional techniques and technology and make available at www.ttaonline.org

Establish coordinated, statewide training to improving literacy for students with disabilities that will enable them to be successful in learning the SOL content. Target middle and high school teachers in high need schools to be trained in the University of Kansas Strategic Instruction Model (SIM). Provide state support for pilot demonstration schools to implement the Content Literacy Continuum Strategic Instruction Model.

Provide coordinated training and technical assistance on the need for and use of assistive technology (AT) with a focus on access to the general curriculum and support for including students with disabilities in general classrooms and community settings.

Maintain coordinated support and establish middle school sites for implementing the Instruction Support Team (IST) model in each of the 8 regions, to enhance, improve, and increase instruction and learning.

Begin a staffing/caseload study to review service delivery models with a goal of identifying models which support the provision of services to students with disabilities in the regular classroom.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include VDOE staff, TTAC staff and others listed in the activity description.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6.

Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

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

Measurement: Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education collects data for this indicator through the December 1 special education child count.

Data are for students ages 2 – 5 because Virginia serves students ages 2 – 22+ under Part B. Previous years' data show changes in the number of students served in early childhood settings, early childhood special education settings and Itinerant services. For students ages 2 – 5, the majority are served in these three categories. School divisions are directed to use the Itinerant Services category for students ages 2 – 5 who only receive speech/language services.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Placement data from December 1, 2004 child count for students ages 2-5.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data reported for the 2004-2005 school year shows a slight decrease (2 percent) in the percentage of students served in early childhood, non-special education settings. There was also a slight increase (2 percent) in the percentage of students served in early childhood, special education settings. There was also a slight decrease (1 percent) in the percentage of students receiving only speech/language services in itinerant settings.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Placement Settings	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
Early Childhood Setting (Not Special Education)	2809	17%	2935	17%	2757	15%
Early Childhood Setting (Special Education)	7838	47%	7843	45%	8461	47%
Home	1049	6%	5	5%	1070	5%
Part Early Childhood Setting (Not Special Education) and Part Early Childhood Setting (Special Education)	923	5%	911	5%	1069	6%
Residential Facility (Public or Private)	17	<1%	4	<1%	19	<1%
Separate School (Public or Private)	65	<1%	99	<1%	135	<1%
Itinerant Service	3914	23%	4169	26%	4532	25%
Reverse Mainstream	60	<1%	36	<1%	29	<1%
TOTAL	16675		17429		18072	

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Increase the percentage of students ages 2-5 served in early childhood, non-special education settings by 1% a year.
2006 (2006-2007)	Increase the percentage of students ages 2-5 served in early childhood, non-special education settings by 1% a year.
2007 (2007-2008)	Increase the percentage of students ages 2-5 served in early childhood, non-special education settings by 1% a year.
2008 (2008-2009)	Increase the percentage of students ages 2-5 served in early childhood, non-special education settings by 1% a year.
2009 (2009-2010)	Increase the percentage of students ages 2-5 served in early childhood, non-special education settings by 1% a year.
2010 (2010-2011)	Increase the percentage of students ages 2-5 served in early childhood, non-special education settings by 1% a year.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Conduct sessions at statewide conferences and meetings on how to set up collaborative classrooms, and other topics concerning inclusive settings as requested by LEAs.

Review, update, and disseminate Integrated Placement Options for Preschoolers (IPOP) materials to all school divisions and T/TAC libraries (by spring 2006).

In cooperation with Part C and Training/Technical Assistant Centers (T/TACs), continue state level initiative on supporting integrated placements for preschoolers with special needs.

The above activities will take place over the course of the 2005-2006 school year.

VDOE staff, Part C staff and T/TAC staff are all resources for the above activities.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7 – New Indicator

Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Measurement:

- | |
|---|
| <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. b. Percent of preschool children who improve functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. c. 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. <p>If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100. c. 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. <p>If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning |
|---|

at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) will obtain guidance from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center and the Mid-South Regional Resource Center in developing a system for assessing the skills included in this indicator. The system will include observations of parents and providers.

Provide guidance and technical assistance on outcome assessment and measurement practices.

Revise on-site monitoring to address data collected and maintained at the school division level to allow for measurement of progress on this indicator.

Provide information to local divisions on which assessment instruments will be acceptable for use in obtaining information on individual students to measure progress on this indicator.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): new indicator

Discussion of Baseline Data: new indicator

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

2010 (2010-2011)	
---------------------	--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8 – New 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) will develop an instrument which will allow parents to report on whether schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. It is anticipated that this instrument will be a survey format and will be developed after consultation with national technical assistance specialists.

Data will be collected from parents concerning participation in school activities focusing on improving services for children with disabilities. Survey questions will be structured to reference involvement in activities with specific objectives to enhance opportunities and program results for children with disabilities

The survey instrument will be distributed to all school divisions, across all levels (elementary, middle and high schools) and across all disability categories.

Analyzing response data will be coordinated with stakeholder members and with input from national technical assistance specialists.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
 State

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9 – New 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))

Measurement:

Data Source:

Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served).

Measurement:

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education’s (VDOE) analysis of previous years’ data identified disproportionate representation in school divisions using a comparison model, including use of OSEP’s “Attachment 2” in VDOE’s 2003-2004 Annual Performance Plan.

VDOE is researching different methodologies for determining whether disproportionate representation exists for racial and ethnic groups in the population for students with disabilities. Once a methodology for determining this is adopted, a decision will be made as to how to include a determination as to whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Data collected for the 2005-2006 school year will be used in the data analysis. Determination of disproportionate representation will be made comparing students with disabilities to non-disabled students. Determination will be made for state level data and for each school division in each of the referenced disability categories. VDOE will review policies, practices and procedures when disproportionate representation is identified.

Follow-up monitoring of changes and revisions to local school division policies, practices and procedures is currently a part of VDOE’s focused monitoring and will continue to be.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	When targets are required to be established for this new indicator, the target will be 0 percent of the school divisions in the state will have disproportionate representation identified.
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10 – New 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))

Measurement:

Data Source:

Data collected for reporting under section 618 (Annual Report of Children Served).

Measurement:

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

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.”

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education’s (VDOE) analysis of previous years’ data identified disproportionate representation in school divisions using a comparison model, including use of OSEP’s Attachment 2 in VDOE’s 2003-2004 Annual Performance Plan.

VDOE is researching different methodologies for determining whether disproportionate representation exists for racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. Once a methodology for determining this is adopted, a decision will be made as to how to include a determination as to whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification. Data collected for the 2005-2006 school year will be used in the data analysis. Determination of disproportionate representation will be made for the disability categories of mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, autism, other health impairments and speech/language impairments. Determination of disproportionate representation will be made for state level data and for each school division in each of the referenced disability categories. VDOE will review policies, practices and procedures when disproportionate representation is identified. Follow-up monitoring of changes and revisions to local school division policies, practices and procedures is currently a part of VDOE’s focused monitoring and will continue to be.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	When targets are required to be established for this new indicator, the target will be 0 percent of the school divisions in the state will have disproportionate representation identified.
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B/Child Find**Indicator 11 – New Indicator**

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 65 business days.

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

Virginia's Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia, effective March 27, 2002, sets forth the timeline for evaluation and eligibility. 8 VAC 20-80-54. Evaluation, states "**evaluations shall be completed within 65 business days of the receipt of the referral by the special education administrator or designee.**" 8 VAC 20-80-56, Eligibility, states "**the local educational agency shall establish procedures to ensure that the decision regarding eligibility for special education and related services is made "within 65 business days after the referral for evaluation is received for an initial evaluation."**

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. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) will begin a three-phase monitoring process on a six-year cycle. Each cycle consists of school divisions of varying size and from each of the eight Superintendent's Regional Study Groups. Each year, 22 school divisions begin the process by conducting a self-assessment and developing a program improvement plan to correct identified noncompliance and to address other areas needing improvement. The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) makes on-site verification visits in the following school year and requires school divisions to amend its program improvement plans when additional noncompliance is determined. VDOE then follows up through desk audits or on-site visits.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Data on this indicator will be collected from the 22 school divisions that will receive on-site verification visits in the 2005-2006 school year. School divisions were asked in the self-assessment “are you meeting the requirement that eligibility is determined within 65 business days;” however, the self-assessments did not request sufficient data to determine a baseline.

Beginning October 2005, VDOE’s monitoring specialists will randomly select a sampling of student files on “initial eligibility” for the 2004-2005 school year from each of the 22 school divisions. The number of files will be determined by the number of students in the district found eligible for special education. The monitoring specialists will select 25 records from school divisions with 50-300 special education students; 50 records from a school division with 301-600 special education students; and 150 from a school division with more than 600 special education students. The monitoring specialist designated to lead the district’s on-site verification visit will review the data and determine if eligibility was determined within 65 business days from the date of referral for evaluation to the director of special education or designee. During the on-site visits, the monitoring specialists will probe to determine the reasons for not completing evaluations within 65 business days. Probing or “drill down” will involve interviews with principals or designees at the building level for the coordination of special education services, school psychologists, the director of special education for the school district, and other school personnel as the need is determined. The data will be tallied to determine the frequency of noncompliance, i.e., exceeding 65 business days by 1-5 business days, 6-15 business days, 16-25 business days, and more than 26 business days. VDOE will be able to determine a baseline and set targets at the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	When targets are required to be established for this new indicator, the target will be 100 percent of the school divisions in the state will be in compliance with this requirement.
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective Supervision Part B/ Transition

Indicator 12 –

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

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

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 eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to the beginning of the school year if they turn age two by Sept. 30 of that school year or prior to their third birthday.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by the beginning of the school year if they turn age two by Sept. 30 of that school year or by their third birthday.

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays.

Percent = c divided by a – b times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) has engaged in efforts to collect data on students transitioning from Part C to Part B by coordinating with Virginia's Part C office. This coordination has included discussions on developing a common data system for both offices to use with school divisions. The difficulty in implementing this resulted in VDOE having to use two sets of data in addressing this area in the Annual Performance Reports (APR) submitted in previous years. VDOE expects to continue this effort with Virginia's Part C office but intends to shift its focus on data collection based on the requirements specified in this indicator.

VDOE believes this should have been designated a new indicator because of the level of detail in the information school divisions will have to maintain. This concern is specifically with the requirements to determine: a.) the number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to the beginning of the school year if they turn age two by Sept. 30 of that school year or prior to their third birthday, and b.) the number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by the beginning of the school year if they turn age two by Sept. 30 of that school year or by their third birthday, and then to account for children included in a but not included in b or c and to indicate

the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays. VDOE believes this level of specificity goes beyond what states were required to report in the Annual Performance Plan. VDOE intends to collect the required data through our on-site monitoring visits scheduled for the 2005-2006 school year in order to be able to establish a baseline for 2006-2007.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Data are currently being collected through VDOE’s on-site monitoring system for the 2005-2006 year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As part of VDOE’s on-site monitoring process, records of children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination will be reviewed. The following information provides a description of how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR. Virginia’s 132 school divisions begin a three-phase monitoring process on a six-year cycle. Each cycle consists of school divisions of varying size and from each of the eight Superintendent’s Regional Study Groups. Each year, 22 school divisions begin the process by conducting a self-assessment and developing a program improvement plan to correct identified noncompliance and to address other areas needing improvement. VDOE makes on-site verification visits in the following school year and requires school divisions to amend its program improvement plans when additional noncompliance is determined. VDOE then follows up through desk audits or on-site visits.

Data on this monitoring priority will be collected from the 22 school divisions that will receive on-site verification visits in the 2005-2006 school year. The self-assessments from these districts did not collect sufficient data to determine a baseline.

Virginia’s Part C office requires that notification be sent to LEAs for all families exiting Part C, not just those potentially eligible for Part B, unless the parent indicates in writing that they do not want the notification sent. VDOE’s monitoring teams will use this information to confirm notification was sent to school divisions. The monitoring teams will also determine the number of students found not eligible and whether eligibilities were determined prior to the beginning of the school year if they turn two by Sept 30 or prior to their third birthday. The monitoring teams will determine the number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by the beginning of the school year if they turn two by Sept 30 of that school year or by their third birthday, and will seek to determine reasons for any delays in determining eligibility. The review will also seek to determine why eligibility was not determined for a child that was served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. VDOE will also continue to monitor compliance with the 65 day timeline for eligibility determination for all students referred for Part B services, regardless of students’ September 30 age or date of their third birthday.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100 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 the beginning of that school year if they turn age 2 by Sept. 30 or by their third birthday.

<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>100 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 the beginning of that school year if they turn age 2 by Sept. 30 or by their third birthday.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>100 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 the beginning of that school year if they turn age 2 by Sept. 30 or by their third birthday.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>100 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 the beginning of that school year if they turn age 2 by Sept. 30 or by their third birthday.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>100 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 the beginning of that school year if they turn age 2 by Sept. 30 or by their third birthday.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>100 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 the beginning of that school year if they turn age 2 by Sept. 30 or by their third birthday.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Revise on-site monitoring process for the 2005-2006 school year to require local divisions to maintain data so compliance can be measured with this indicator.

In cooperation with Part C personnel, VDOE will conduct meetings in all Superintendents’ Planning Districts to discuss the transition process from Part C to Part B/619. The focus of these meetings will be to emphasize the importance of ensuring the smooth transition to Part B services for students formally served under Part C.

In addition to the meetings referenced above, VDOE will disseminate information and guidance on the importance of transitioning Part C students to Part B programs at VDOE’s local special education directors’ Council meetings.

The data analysis of the referral and enrollment information for this indicator will also be reviewed by the stakeholder workgroup working with this indicator.

In cooperation with Part C personnel, VDOE will update and disseminate the *Early Childhood Transition from Part C Early Intervention to Part B Special Education and Other Services for Young Children with Disabilities* document to reflect changes created by the 2004 amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. This information is currently available on the VDOE website and the revised version will be posted as well.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include VDOE staff, TTAC staff and others listed in the activity description.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B – Effective Transition

Indicator 13 – New Indicator

Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

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

Measurement:

Data Source:

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

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) will work with school divisions participating in the Transition Outcome Project (TOP) to collect information on the percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet postsecondary goals. Approximately one third of the state's school divisions are currently conducting IEP reviews through voluntary participation in this project. It is anticipated that the number of participating divisions will continue to increase.

In order to collect baseline data, a weighted stratified randomized sampling procedure will be used to search student files stored on the Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center's (VCU-RRTC) server. The files will be searched based on the following strata: Superintendent Regions, age, and type of disability. Low incidence populations and rural school divisions will be over sampled. This will allow the results of students in "low incidence" disability categories and regions of the state with smaller numbers of special education populations to be generalized to the larger statewide population. Data will be compiled and analyzed by the VCU-RRTC and reports will be submitted to the VDOE. Once baseline data have been collected, targets can be developed and decisions made about collection of data for future reporting.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
 State

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>When targets are required to be established for this new indicator, the target will be 100 percent of the school divisions in the state will be in compliance with this requirement.</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14 – New Indicator

Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

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

Measurement:

Data Source:

State selected data source.

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) will have one of the stakeholder workgroups assist with developing and implementing a data collection system and with analyzing data results. Preliminary discussions indicate VDOE will use a weighted stratified random sample. VDOE intends to collect data from all school divisions, using local high schools as the unit of sampling analysis. The sample size will ensure enough respondents to offset potential low response rates. The Department will establish the sample size using 2004-2005 data for students with disabilities exiting high school and will establish the cohort of students with disabilities to interview in each school division. Initial discussions on data collection have explored having telephone interviews conducted by local school division personnel.

VDOE will also work with national technical assistance centers to obtain assistance in developing activities related to this indicator.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B
--

Indicator 15 –

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

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

Measurement:**Data Source:**

Self-assessment reports submitted to VDOE May 15, 2004 - July 1, 2004, and on-site reviews in FY 2004-2005 involving 22 school divisions

Measurement:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = 36 divided by 36 times 100 = 100%

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = 3 divided by 3 times 100 = 100%

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE) general supervision system consists of multi-faceted monitoring processes to identify noncompliance in special education programs. Components of the state's system includes stakeholder involvement; application for funding; review of policies and procedures; data collection, reporting and verification; self-assessments and on-site monitoring with parent involvement; and dispute resolution. On-site monitoring includes visits to 132 school divisions,

including regional special education programs, local and regional jails, and nursing homes; state-operated programs including hospital programs, schools for the deaf and blind, a rehabilitation center, and juvenile detention and adult correctional facilities; and private day and residential schools.

Beginning in the fall of 1996, VDOE has monitored school divisions on a six-year cycle. Twenty-two (22) of the state's 132 school divisions begin a three-phase monitoring process by submitting a self-assessment each May (extensions may be granted through June). VDOE staff work with each school division throughout the review process. Each review cycle includes school divisions of different sizes (small, medium, large), and in each of the State's eight Superintendent's Regional Study Groups.

In late July or early August of each year, a Summer Monitoring Institute is offered for all school divisions that will be submitting a self-assessment in the following year. At the institute "compliance and continuous program improvement" are emphasized. The assigned staff person makes at least three contacts (through a combination of meetings, phone contacts and other methods) with each school division while it is developing its self-assessment in order to provide any needed technical assistance and other support. While some school divisions are more thorough than others, the majority produce candid and largely accurate self-assessments. School divisions' self-assessments have improved overall from the first cycle, which began in 1996, to the second cycle, which began in 2002.

School divisions use a variety of terms (including "noncompliance" and "concerns") to label practices that are inconsistent with the law; however, VDOE requires all school divisions to correct any violations of the law regardless of what they are called. School divisions are directed to correct any noncompliance as quickly as possible. The message to school divisions is "find it, fix it" and develop a plan, including timelines, for correcting any noncompliance findings, as part of their self-assessment. School divisions are also encouraged to address issues of identified concerns. The self-assessments are reviewed by VDOE staff to ensure that each is complete and includes an appropriate corrective action plan for any noncompliance findings. If it is determined that there are gaps in the self-assessment, staff work with the school division to complete the self-assessment and to ensure the appropriateness of the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and CAP timelines. Generally, school divisions have corrected each of the areas of noncompliance that the division identified through its self-assessment by the time of VDOE's on-site visit.

During the school year, after a school division submits its self-assessment, VDOE develops a profile of the school division, integrating data across systems. Data are collected from due process hearings, complaints, mediation, state assessments of Virginia's Standards of Learning, teacher licensure, previous monitoring results, child count, school accreditation, and academic review reports.

VDOE conducts on-site visits to: (1) validate the accuracy of the school division's self-assessment; (2) determine the extent to which the school division has corrected any noncompliance that has been identified; and (3) identify any additional areas of noncompliance. The on-site review team focuses on areas most closely linked to student academic achievement, including: (1) child find, evaluations and eligibility determination; (2) access and supports in the general education curriculum; (3) participation in the statewide assessment program; (4) development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs); (5) discipline; (6) secondary transition; (7) parent involvement; and (8) out-of-district placements. During the review, a public meeting is offered to provide parents, students and other parties the opportunity to meet with the monitoring team and make comments about the school division's special education program. The comments are used to further identify areas to focus on during the review. Following the review, the team leader follows up with the school division's director of special education on actions taken to address parents' issues/concerns.

The on-site visit is also used to follow up on the implementation of improvement strategies for areas identified in the self-assessment as needing improvement. VDOE tailors the scope and intensity of each on-site visit to the school division. Within six weeks after an on-site monitoring visit, the director of Federal Program Monitoring and the coordinator of the review issue a monitoring report to the school division's superintendent.

VDOE sets timelines for correction, ranging from immediately to up to one year. For situations in which students are waiting for services, VDOE requires the school division to provide evidence that it has initiated correction prior to the end of the VDOE visit. If VDOE finds during the on-site visit that a school division has not completed correction of previously identified noncompliance, it will conduct one or more follow-up visits. If it is determined that noncompliance continues at the time of the follow-up visit, VDOE then requires 30-day, 60-day, or quarterly progress reports, and may also follow-up through frequent visits and /or telephone contacts. To verify correction of noncompliance, school divisions submit documentation of correction. In some cases, VDOE continues to work with a school division after the division has corrected the noncompliance in order to ensure that the school division maintains compliance and/or to focus on continuous improvement.

To ensure that all school divisions correct any identified deficiencies within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed one year from identification, VDOE has implemented a tracking system to monitor the correction of the noncompliance findings that were identified through local division self-assessments and the State's on-site reviews. Tracking of noncompliant findings in the self-assessment begins following receipt of the self-assessment reports and program improvement plans. Tracking of noncompliant findings resulting from VDOE's on-site reviews begins from the date of the review.

Out-of-District Placements. VDOE monitors compliance for children with disabilities who have been publicly-placed in private residential and private day schools in three ways: (1) each school division must review compliance for such children as part of its self-assessment; (2) VDOE reviews the files for these children when it conducts its on-site visit to the school division that placed them in a private setting; and (3) VDOE monitors to ensure the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to these children by visiting the private schools during a three-year licensure cycle. State-operated programs and private residential facilities are monitored through the State's Interdepartmental Regulation Program, a joint effort of the Departments of Education, Juvenile Justice, Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services, and Social Services.

Services provided to youth with disabilities in nursing facilities and local and regional jails are likewise monitored in three ways: (1) each school division must review compliance for such children and youth as part of its self-assessment; (2) VDOE reviews the files for these children and youth when it conducts its on-site visit to the school division; and (3) VDOE monitors to ensure the provision of FAPE to these students by making on-site visits.

VDOE monitors to ensure the provision of FAPE to students in state juvenile correctional facilities and students in the state schools for the deaf and blind by conducting on-site compliance reviews during a three-year licensure cycle. VDOE also makes visits to adult correctional facilities.

Academic Review Process. VDOE's academic review process is a focused monitoring approach coordinated in VDOE's Office of School Improvement. It is used in school divisions and schools having difficulty reaching targeted levels of academic performance and specific Standards of Learning (SOL) goals. The on-site reviews are designed to help schools identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The focus of the review process is on the systems, processes, and practices that are being implemented at the school and division levels. Specifically, information is gathered that relates to the alignment of the local curriculum with state learning standards, use of time and school scheduling practices, use of data to make instructional and planning decisions, school-based programs of professional development, implementation of school improvement plans, implementation of an instructional intervention program for schools warned in English or Mathematics, allocation of resources aligned to areas of need and use of learning environments focused on shared ownership of staff, parents and community. Each review team includes at least one specialist from the State's Special Education Training/Technical Assistance Centers or some other person knowledgeable about special education (usually former directors of special education) that reviews services to students with disabilities. When there is concern that a school is in noncompliance with IDEA, the matter is reported to the special education monitoring unit for follow up. A district's special education monitoring may be coordinated with its academic review. Data collected through the Academic review process are a valuable data source that helps to guide special education compliance monitoring.

Enforcement Actions. VDOE has utilized various enforcement actions with school divisions that demonstrate noncompliance, including: (1) conducting more frequent on-site visits, making telephone contacts; (2) requiring continued progress reports; (3) calling or meeting with the local superintendent; (4) returning for another full on-site visit; and (5) requiring the school division superintendent to meet with the state superintendent. VDOE withheld one school division's Part B funds regarding an implementation issue following approval of the school division's local application for Part B funds; however, VDOE typically uses this sanction for issues that arise in connection with its disapproval of local applications for Part B funds.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

100% of the requirements related to monitoring priority areas and indicators found in noncompliance that were identified by school divisions in the self-assessments and by VDOE during its on-site reviews were corrected within one year of identification.

100% of the requirements related to areas not included in the monitoring priority areas and indicators found in noncompliance that were identified by school divisions in the self-assessments and by VDOE during its on-site reviews was corrected within one year of identification.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The baseline represents data resulting from a three-phase monitoring process involving 22 of Virginia's 132 school divisions. In May/June 2004, twenty-two (22) school divisions submitted self-assessments to VDOE and received on-site visits by VDOE's monitoring specialists. By the close of the 2003-2004 school year, VDOE determined that all noncompliance findings in the self-assessments had been corrected. In 2004-2005, VDOE followed up with each school division that received additional noncompliance citations, requested documentation, and revisited districts when necessary. Extensive desk audits and consistent follow up resulted in verification that 100% of the noncompliance findings resulting from on-site reviews were corrected within one year. All self-assessment and all on-site findings of none-compliance were corrected within one year.

VDOE has implemented a tracking system that helps to assess school divisions' progress in implementing corrective action. Tracking notations alert the monitoring specialists so that timely contacts are made with school officials to ensure corrections as soon as possible but within one year of identification.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of the findings identified through monitoring will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of the findings identified through monitoring will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of the findings identified through monitoring will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of the findings identified through monitoring will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of the findings identified through monitoring will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of the findings identified through monitoring will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continue to restructure the state’s monitoring system to implement effective focused monitoring. Utilize conference calls, teleconferences, print materials, etc. on focused monitoring	August 2005 – ongoing	Mid-South Regional Resource Center, National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to enhance focus monitoring
Convene monitoring stakeholder group to identify key performance indicators for focused monitoring	January 2005	Stakeholder group –representatives of parents, school division superintendents, directors of special education, State Special Education Advisory Committee

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Conduct a session on focused monitoring at the Virginia Council of Administrators of Special Education, Spring Conference, 2006	Spring 2006	VDOE staff, NCSEAM
Continue to coordinate with the Office of School Improvement; follow up on noncompliance findings identified through academic reviews; maintain personnel with expertise in special education on academic reviews;	Ongoing	VDOE's Office of School Improvement; special education technical assistance designee working with Academic reviews, Office of Special Education Instructional Services
Continue to stress the requirement that all noncompliance shall be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification	Ongoing	Monitoring reports, publications, Special Education Directors' Council and directors regional meetings
Continue to impose specific timelines and require progress reports when school divisions are found in noncompliance; impose sanctions when school divisions fail to show evidence of corrections of noncompliance within one year of identification	Ongoing	Monitoring staff; special education technical assistance staff
Continue to seek to determine the cause of recurring noncompliance and effective strategies to correct problems. Offer statewide technical assistance on the areas frequently cited in noncompliance.	Ongoing	Focus monitoring; monitoring staff, school division personnel; State Training and Technical Assistance Centers (T/TACs)
Continue to track school divisions' progress toward implementing corrective action plans that were developed as a result of findings through self-assessments and VDOE's on-site reviews	Ongoing	Monitoring staff
Coordinate with all VDOE areas with monitoring functions to ensure the identification and correction of noncompliance	Ongoing	VDOE's Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services, Student Services, Special Education Instructional Services, Financial and Data Services

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

<p>Maintain an on-going presence with school officials and other special interest groups by attending meetings and presenting monitoring data</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Directors' Council Meetings, Regional Meetings, Virginia's Council of Administrators for Special Education, New Administrators Academy, State Special Education Advisory Committee, etc.;</p> <p>VDOE's Office of Financial and Data Services and the Office of School Improvement</p>
<p>Continue to have local school officials to take an active role in VDOE's on-site monitoring of school divisions, participating in record reviews; direct more involvement/participation of placing districts with services to out-of-district placements</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Monitoring staff including specialists for private schools</p>
<p>Continue to make on-site visits to private schools and state-operated programs; hold private schools responsible for making contacts to the placing school division; coordinate with the monitoring specialist assigned to lead the monitoring in the school division where the private school is located</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Monitoring staff, Special Education Directors' Council</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B, continued - complaints and due process hearings

Indicator 15 (continued) –

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

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

- C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:
- a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms.
 - b. # of findings of noncompliance made.
 - c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification
- Percent = c divided by b times 100

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

VDOE's Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services (ODR/AS) is responsible for managing the system of complaints, mediations, and due process hearings. ODR/AS uses multiple levels of tracking logs to identify compliance with timelines, to effectively manage the systems, to respond to requests for data, and to identify systemic issues. An annual report is provided to parents, school administrators, and other consumers, as well as posting it on the agency's Web site.

Review of the implementation of all corrective action plans (CAPs) is systematically completed within a year of VDOE's approval of the CAP for the previous school year. This means that the CAPs required, reviewed and approved for 2004-2005 will be reviewed during the 2005-2006 school year to ensure full implementation. VDOE consistently maintains the tracking log and system described in the CIMP Report and Annual Performance Plan of 2004 for continued accountability in this area.

ODR/AS continues to utilize its tracking systems and annual report to identify trends, follow-up activities to ensure full implementation of complaint corrective action plans and due process implementation plans for hearing officers' decisions. These systems, including tracking logs and template communications to parents and school administrators, were first described in VDOE's Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan (CIMP) and updated through VDOE's Annual Performance Report. ODR/AS continues to maintain supervision instruments, procedures, and electronic tracking logs for dispute resolution systems to ensure that all mandates are met.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

VDOE identified 58 non-compliance findings in complaints received. 53 of those non-compliance findings were corrected within one year of identification (91.4%).

VDOE identified 6 non-compliance findings in due process hearings. All 6 of those non-compliance findings were corrected within one year of identification (100%).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

91.4% of the noncompliance findings identified through complaints were corrected within one year of identification.

100% of the noncompliance findings identified through due process were corrected within one year of identification

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of the findings identified through complaints and due process will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of the findings identified through complaints and due process will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of the findings identified through complaints and due process will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of the findings identified through complaints and due process will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of the findings identified through complaints and due process will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of the findings identified through complaints and due process will be corrected in a timely manner, not to exceed one year of identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Maintain electronic tracking logs for all dispute resolution systems to ensure compliance within mandated timelines.

Monitor correction of noncompliance findings.

Address trends of IDEA noncompliance.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services Staff and MSRRC.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16 –

Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

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

Data Source:

Data collected on Attachment 1

Measurement:

Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education’s (VDOE) Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services (ODR/AS) is responsible for managing the complaints system. In order to achieve 100% compliance with regulatory timelines, ODR/AS uses multiple levels of tracking logs to identify compliance with timelines, to effectively manage the system, to respond to requests for data, and to identify systemic issues. This system, in addition to template communications to parents and school administrators, was first described in VDOE’s Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan (CIMP) and updated through VDOE’s Annual Performance Report (APR). Also, an ODR/AS Annual Report is provided to parents, school administrators, other consumers, and posted on the ODR/AS website.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

116 total reports were issued by VDOE’s ODR/AS. Seventy-seven reports were issued within the 60-day timeline. Thirty-eight reports were issued within an extended timeline. One report of the 116 total reports was issued without a documented extension for exceptional circumstances.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In the 2004-2005 reporting period, ODR/AS issued 77 reports within the 60-day timeline and 38 reports within extended timelines for a total of 115 reports, divided by 116, the total number of reports issued by ODR/AS, multiplied by 100, totaling a percentage of 99.14 signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	VDOE will resolve 100 % of all signed written complaints within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.
2006 (2006-2007)	VDOE will resolve 100 % of all signed written complaints within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.
2007 (2007-2008)	VDOE will resolve 100 % of all signed written complaints within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.
2008 (2008-2009)	VDOE will resolve 100 % of all signed written complaints within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.
2009 (2009-2010)	VDOE will resolve 100 % of all signed written complaints within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.
2010 (2010-2011)	VDOE will resolve 100 % of all signed written complaints within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Maintain electronic tracking logs for dispute resolution systems to include a monthly review of tracking logs for each program to ensure timely corrections of noncompliance findings and to ensure that all mandates are met.

Complete the Alternative Dispute Resolution Guide by June 30, 2006.

Continue to provide information on dispute resolution to parents and other consumers.

Develop work plan through service agreement with the Alliance for Systems Change/Mid-South Regional Resource Center (MSRRC) to address noncompliance issues related to IEP implementation.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services Staff and MSRRC.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17 –

Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

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

Measurement:

Data Source:

Data collected on Attachment 1.

Measurement:

Percent = (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education’s (VDOE) Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services (ODR/AS) is responsible for managing the due process system. ODR/AS uses multiple levels of tracking logs to identify compliance with timelines, to effectively manage the system, to respond to requests for data, and to identify systemic issues. This system, in addition to template communications to parents and school administrators, was first described in VDOE’s Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan (CIMP) and updated through VDOE’s Annual Performance Report (APR). Also, an ODR/AS Annual Report is provided to parents, school administrators, other consumers, and posted on the ODR/AS website.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Twenty-eight total reports were issued by hearing officers. Eight decisions were issued within the required 45 day timeline and 20 decisions were issued within extended timelines.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In the 2004-2005 reporting period, hearing officers issued 8 decisions within the 45-day timeline and 21 decisions within properly extended timelines for a total of 29 decisions. 100% of hearing officers’ decisions were fully adjudicated within the required 45-day timeline or a timeline that was properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Hearing officers will issue 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing decisions within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2006 (2006-2007)	Hearing officers will issue 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing decisions within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2007 (2007-2008)	Hearing officers will issue 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing decisions within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2008 (2008-2009)	Hearing officers will issue 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing decisions within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2009 (2009-2010)	Hearing officers will issue 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing decisions within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.
2010 (2010-2011)	Hearing officers will issue 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing decisions within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Maintain electronic tracking logs for dispute resolution systems to include the tracking log to monitor 45-day hearing timelines; monitoring hearing officer’s management of timelines; and reviewing weekly active files to ensure extensions are documented.

Utilize ODR/AS’ tracking systems and Annual Report to identify trends and follow-up activities to ensure full implementation of due process implementation plans of hearing officer’s decisions.

Provide annual training for hearing officers, with emphasis on timelines, including assignment of mentors and completion of performance measures to ensure compliance.

Complete development of a guidance document for hearing officers on management of timelines for conducting due process hearings by July 2006.

Complete the Alternative Dispute Resolution Guide by June 30, 2006.

Continue to provide information on dispute resolution to parents and other consumers.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services Staff and MSRRC.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18 – New 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))

Measurement:
Data Source:
 Data collected on Attachment 1.
Measurement:
 Percent = 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education’s (VDOE) Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services is responsible for managing the due process system. ODR/AS has developed additional sections in it tracking logs to identify the use of the Resolution Session for resolving due process issues. ODR/AS already initiated technical assistance activities, which includes providing guidance on the early resolution process to hearing officers, school divisions, and parents.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19 –

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:
Data Source:
Data collected on Attachment 1.
Measurement:
Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education’s (VDOE) Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services is responsible for managing the mediation system. ODR/AS uses multiple levels of tracking logs to effectively manage the system, to respond to requests for data, and to identify systemic issues. This system was first described in VDOE’s CIMP and updated through VDOE’s Annual Performance Report. An Annual Report is provided to parents, school administrators, and other consumers, as well as posting it on the division’s website.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Seventeen mediation agreements related to due process and 67 mediation agreements not related to due process were reached for a total of 84 agreements, divided by 111, the total number of mediations, totaling 75.68% performance.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In the 2004-2005 reporting period, 17 mediation agreements related to due process, and 67 mediation agreements not related to due process, were reached for a total of 84 mediation agreements. This total, divided by 111 (the total number of mediations), then multiplied by 100, results in a total percentage of 75.68 mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>Maintain a 76-80+% range rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements, acknowledging that the goal is to provide quality in the mediation services by on-going training, observation of and debriefing with the mediators, as well as continuing to encourage and support mediations.*** 100% of mediations will not delay or deny the parent's right to a due process hearing.</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>Maintain a 76-80+% range rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements, acknowledging that the goal is to provide quality in the mediation services by on-going training, observation of and debriefing with the mediators, as well as continuing to encourage and support mediations.*** 100% of mediations will not delay or deny the parent's right to a due process hearing.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Maintain a 76-80+% range rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements, acknowledging that the goal is to provide quality in the mediation services by on-going training, observation of and debriefing with the mediators, as well as continuing to encourage and support mediations.*** 100% of mediations will not delay or deny the parent's right to a due process hearing.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>Maintain a 76-80+% range rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements, acknowledging that the goal is to provide quality in the mediation services by on-going training, observation of and debriefing with the mediators, as well as continuing to encourage and support mediations.*** 100% of mediations will not delay or deny the parent's right to a due process hearing.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>Maintain a 76-80+% range rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements, acknowledging that the goal is to provide quality in the mediation services by on-going training, observation of and debriefing with the mediators, as well as continuing to encourage and support mediations.*** 100% of mediations will not delay or deny the parent's right to a due process hearing.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>Maintain a 76-80+% range rate of mediations that result in mediation agreements, acknowledging that the goal is to provide quality in the mediation services by on-going training, observation of and debriefing with the mediators, as well as continuing to encourage and support mediations.*** 100% of mediations will not delay or deny the parent's right to a due process hearing.</p>

The fundamental principles of mediation are that participation is voluntary and the outcome is self-directed by participants. If SEAs are required to have a 100% target rate, we cease performing mediation and are engaging in a form of arm-twisting usually reserved for judicial chambers. The objective should be supporting and developing mediators who are aware of their options, reflecting about their choices of intervention or silence and respectful of the parties' issues and choices. The concept of setting ever-higher agreement rates as a goal creates a mediator-centered, authority-based process rather than a client-centered process because it brings to the table a pressure and agenda separate from what the parties bring.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____Virginia_____
State

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Utilize ODR/AS tracking systems and Annual Report to identify trends.

Maintain electronic tracking logs for dispute resolution systems to include a monthly review of tracking logs for each program to ensure that mediations are scheduled and completed in a timely manner.

Complete the Alternative Dispute Resolution Guide June 30, 2006.

Continue to provide information on dispute resolution to parents and other consumers.

The timeline for the above activities is for the 2005-2006 school year.

Resources include Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services Staff and MSRRRC.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See overview description in introduction section.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20 –

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

Measurement:
Data Source:
State selected data sources, including data from State data system, assessment system, as well as technical assistance and monitoring systems.
Measurement:
State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:
a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) engages in several activities to ensure required reporting timelines are met and that data reported are accurate.

Data collected through the December 1 child count (indicators 5, 6, 9 and 10) receive extensive editing, including edit checks in school divisions prior to submitting data; edit checks at VDOE at the data upload stage; electronic editing at VDOE to identify and correct duplicate records reported and additional edits conducted by VDOE staff. All child count data, including placement data, are verified through local superintendents' signature.

Data collected through VDOE's annual end of year reports (Indicators 1 and 2) are edited by VDOE staff and verified by local division superintendents.

Data collected for Virginia's state assessment programs (Indicator 3) meet all NCLB reporting requirements.

Data collected on dispute resolution activities (Indicators 16, 17, 18 and 19) are maintained and verified by VDOE's Office of Special Education and Students Services Dispute Resolution staff.

Data on suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities (Indicator 4) are collected through VDOE's annual discipline/crime and violence report. Data are edited by VDOE staff and have local division superintendent verification.

SPP Template – Part B (3)

_____ Virginia _____
State

All of the above information on data collection procedures, data editing and data verification was provided to OSEP staff during Virginia's verification visit in March 2005.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

All required reports were submitted in accordance with reporting requirements and within required timelines.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	All State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2006 (2006-2007)	All State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2007 (2007-2008)	All State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2008 (2008-2009)	All State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2009 (2009-2010)	All State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.
2010 (2010-2011)	All State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) will be timely and accurate.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

VDOE staff responsible for data collection and reporting will annually review all collection and verification procedure to determine whether any changes are needed to ensure the timely and accurate reporting of data.

Part B – SPP/ARP Attachment 1 (Form)

**Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearing**

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	167
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	116
(a) Reports with findings	61
(b) Reports within timeline	77
(c) Reports within extended timelines	38
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	48
(1.3) Complaints pending	3
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	133
(2.1) Mediations	111
(a) Mediations related to due process	29
(i) Mediation agreements	17
(b) Mediations not related to due process	82
(i) Mediation agreements	67
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	22

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	107
(3.1) Resolution sessions	N/A
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	28
(a) Decisions within timeline	8
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	20
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	68

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	11
(4.1) Resolution sessions	N/A
(a) Settlement agreements	N/A
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	4
(a) Change of placement ordered	4

Part B SPP/ARP

OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 01/31/2006)

Part B Attachment 1 (Form)