# Nevada State Performance Plan
# Annual Performance Report
# Eureka County School District Performance Indicator Data – 2010-2011 (May 2012)

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004) requires states to develop and submit a State Performance Plan (SPP) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the U.S. Department of Education. The SPP is designed to evaluate the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEA and describe how the state will improve its implementation. The plan consists of several priority areas with specific indicators defined for each area. Measurable and rigorous targets are defined for each indicator to show progress throughout the period of the SPP. For school year 2010-2011, states are required to report publicly on the performance of school districts for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. The table below shows how this school district performed on specific indicators and whether or not the district met the state's annual targets for those indicators as defined in the Nevada State Performance Plan.

A link to the Nevada State Performance Plan, Part B for 2005-2012 can be found at on the Department of Education website at http://www.doe.nv.gov/edteam/ndeoffices/sped-diversity-improve/resources.html.

| **State Performance Indicator** | | 2010-2011 State Target | 2010-2011 District Data | Did District Meet State Target? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1.** | Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma—district percentage at or above state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported for 2009-2010 data against the 2009-2010 target). | 50% | --[1] | **No** |
| **2.** | Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school—district percentage at or below state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported for 2009-2010 data against the 2009-2010 target). | 6.2% | -- | **Yes** |
| **3.** | A. Adequate yearly progress (AYP) for students with IEPs. If district has minimum "n" size and makes AYP, district meets state target. (NA=district did not meet minimum "n" size) | Yes | NA | **NA** |
| | B. MATH – Assessment participation rate for students with IEPs. | 95% | 100% | **Yes** |
| | READING – Assessment participation rate for students with IEPs. | 95% | 100% | **Yes** |
| | C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs. | | | |
| | Mathematics – 3rd | 42% | -- | **No** |
| | Mathematics – 4th | 36% | NA | **NA** |
| | Mathematics – 5th | 34% | NA | **NA** |
| | Mathematics – 6th | 29% | -- | **Yes** |
| | Mathematics – 7th | 22% | -- | **Yes** |
| | Mathematics – 8th | 24.5% | -- | **Yes** |
| | Mathematics – 11th | 21.5% | -- | **Yes** |
| | English Language Arts – 3rd | 32.5% | -- | **No** |
| | English Language Arts – 4th | 31% | NA | **NA** |
| | English Language Arts – 5th | 27.5% | NA | **NA** |
| | English Language Arts – 6th | 25% | -- | **Yes** |
| | English Language Arts – 7th | 22% | -- | **No** |
| | English Language Arts – 8th | 23.5% | -- | **No** |
| | English Language Arts – 11th | 31% | -- | **Yes** |

[1] Data not presented for groups fewer than 10.

| State Performance Indicator | | 2010-2011 State Target | 2010-2011 District Data | Did District Meet State Target? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4.** | A. Significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year, when compared to statewide average. District percentage at or below state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported for 2009-2010 data against the 2009-2010 target). (NA=district did not meet minimum "n" size) | No significant discrepancy | NA | **NA** |
| | B. Significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities, by race or ethnicity, for greater than 10 days in a school year, when compared to statewide average, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with IDEA requirements (this indicator is required to be reported for 2009-2010 data against the 2009-2010 target). (NA=district did not meet minimum "n" size) | No significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity + noncompliant policies, procedures or practices | NA | **NA** |
| **5.** | A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. District percentage at or above state target meets state target. | 56% | 100% | **Yes** |
| | B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. District percentage at or below state target meets state target. | 15.2% | 0% | **Yes** |
| | C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. District percentage at or below state target meets state target. | 1.6% | 0% | **Yes** |
| **6.** | Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 who received special education and related services and settings with typically developing peers. | Baseline data are currently being collected. Indicator 6 data will be reported in future years. | | |
| **7.** | **Outcome A:** Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | | | |
| | 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 74.4% | 100% | **Yes** |
| | 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 74.7% | 100% | **Yes** |
| | **Outcome B:** Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) | | | |
| | 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 73.1% | 100% | **Yes** |
| | 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 66.8% | 66.7% | **No** |
| | **Outcome C:** Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | | | |
| | 1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 76.0% | 100% | **Yes** |
| | 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 77.8% | 100% | **Yes** |

| State Performance Indicator | | 2010-2011 State Target | 2010-2011 District Data | Did District Meet State Target? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **8.** | Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (NA=district was not surveyed because district was not selected for monitoring during 2010-2011) | 76% | 100% | **Yes** |
| **9.** | Disproportionate representation (DR) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. | No DR | No DR | **Yes** |
| **10.** | Disproportionate representation (DR) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. | No DR | No DR | **Yes** |
| **11.** | Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within state-established timeline of 45 school days. (NA=district was not selected for monitoring during 2010-2011) | 100% | 100% | **Yes** |
| **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. (NA= district was not selected for monitoring during 2010-2011) | 100% | 100% | **Yes** |
| **13.** | Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes various required components for transition from secondary school to reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. (NA=district was not selected for monitoring during 2010-2011) | 100% | 100% | **Yes** |
| **14.** | A. Percent of youth (who were no longer enrolled in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) who were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. | 25% | 33% | **Yes** |
| | B. Percent of youth (who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) who were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. | 54% | 33% | **No** |
| | C. Percent of youth (who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) who were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. | 70% | 100% | **Yes** |

## Determination Under IDEA for 2010-2011

In accordance with federal requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) is required to make an annual determination of each school district's status in implementing the purposes and requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This annual determination is based upon a review of each district's data against the state targets established for performance and compliance indicators under the Nevada State Performance Plan. "Performance" indicators for school year 2010-2011 include Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 7, 8, and 14. "Compliance" indicators for school year 2010-2011 include Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 as well as correction of noncompliance identified during the previous year reported as state-level data under Indicator 15.

School districts that were determined to "meet requirements" (a) reported accurate and timely data, (b) demonstrated substantial compliance for Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (as applicable) at a 95-100% rate, and (c) demonstrated correction of noncompliance identified during the previous year at a 95-100% rate. School districts that were determined to "need assistance" (a) did not report accurate and/or timely data but took action to correct data systems; (b) demonstrated substantial compliance for Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (as applicable) at a 75-94% rate; (c) demonstrated correction of noncompliance identified during the previous year at a 95-100% rate; and (d) met a target for at least one performance indicator.

Based on these criteria, the Eureka County School District determination for 2010-2011 is: **Meets Requirements**.