

# Nevada State Performance Plan

## Annual Performance Report

### Humboldt County School District Performance Indicator Data – 2006-2007

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004) requires states to develop and submit a six-year 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 six-year period. For school year 2006-2007, states are required to report publicly on the performance of school districts for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. 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 2005-2010 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		2006-2007 State Target	2006-2007 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 <u>above</u> state target meets state target.	22%	26%	<b>Yes</b>
2.	Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school—district percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	7.4%	3%	<b>Yes</b>
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	<b>NA</b>
	B. Statewide assessment participation rate for students with IEPs.	95%	100%	<b>Yes</b>
	C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.			
	Mathematics – 3rd	34%	42%	<b>Yes</b>
	Mathematics – 4th	32%	44%	<b>Yes</b>
	Mathematics – 5th	26%	31%	<b>Yes</b>
	Mathematics – 6th	25%	17%	<b>No</b>
	Mathematics – 7th	18%	18%	<b>Yes</b>
	Mathematics – 8th	18.5%	13%	<b>No</b>
	Mathematics – 10th	15.5%	19%	<b>Yes</b>
	English Language Arts – 3rd	26.5%	33%	<b>Yes</b>
	English Language Arts – 4th	27%	22%	<b>No</b>
	English Language Arts – 5th	21.5%	17%	<b>No</b>
	English Language Arts – 6th	21%	33%	<b>Yes</b>
	English Language Arts – 7th	18%	28%	<b>Yes</b>
	English Language Arts – 8th	19.5%	25%	<b>Yes</b>
	English Language Arts – 10th	27%	31%	<b>Yes</b>

State Performance Indicator		2006-2007 State Target	2006-2007 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 (2.41%). District percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	2.41%	0.43%	<b>Yes</b>
5.	A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. District percentage at or <u>above</u> state target meets state target.	54%	50%	<b>No</b>
	B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. District percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	15.6%	9.6%	<b>Yes</b>
	C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. District percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	1.7%	0.5%	<b>Yes</b>
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.	Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 who demonstrate improved social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	Baseline data are currently being collected. Indicator 7 data will be reported in future years.		
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 statewide monitoring during 2006-2007)	72%	58%	<b>No</b>
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	<b>Yes</b>
10.	Disproportionate representation (DR) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	No DR	No DR	<b>Yes</b>
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 had no initial referrals)	100%	98%	<b>No</b>
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 had no Part C transitions)	100%	60%	<b>No</b>
13.	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. (NA=district was not selected for statewide monitoring during 2006-2007)	100%	22%	<b>No</b>
14.	Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Baseline data are currently being collected. Indicator 14 data will be reported in future years.		