

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

General Supervision System:

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

Overview

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE), Office of Special Education is committed to ensuring that ALL students in Nevada are college- and career- ready upon exit from the public school system. To accomplish this, the NDE Office of Special Education through its Director and six Education Program Professionals strives to build and improve on collaborative efforts with state partners and education stakeholders state-wide. It is our goal to promote educational success for Nevada's students through increased academic rigor; use of evidenced-based practices; providing sustained professional development for administrators, teachers, and staff; providing technical assistance in data-based decision making; and building meaningful partnerships with districts, schools, and parents. The Office of Special Education website is located at http://www.doe.nv.gov/Office_of_Special_Education/. The website provides access to numerous resources and reports, each designed to provide information and technical assistance to LEAs, parents, critical partners, and other stakeholders in the community.

Following is a description of the NDE's systems for:

- Monitoring
- Data Management and Reporting
- Fiscal Management
- Dispute Resolution
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

Nevada's Monitoring System

Nevada's monitoring procedures are described below.

- NDE conducts policy/procedure/form review for procedural compliance
- NDE facilitates comprehensive record review in each LEA (17 school districts and the state charter school authority) at least once every four years, and facilitates a targeted record review as necessary in each LEA each year (targeted to previous noncompliance findings)
 - on-site monitoring is conducted in each LEA at least once every four years
 - a 90-item checklist is used to monitor the record for each student selected for monitoring
 - Nevada implements a 100% compliance criterion
 - all noncompliance, both individual and systemic, is corrected within one year of identification
- The schedule has been established to ensure selection of a representative group of LEAs to be monitored each year. A stratified sampling is used to ensure a representative group of LEAs in each of the four years of Nevada's four-year monitoring cycle. Nevada's 17 school districts, which are contiguous with Nevada's 17 counties, have been assigned status as either "urban" (4 districts), "medium rural" (5 districts), or "small rural" (8 districts) depending on the relative size of the LEA and the relative urbanicity of the county seat. The state charter school authority, which includes schools throughout the state, has been assigned status as a "medium rural" LEA. In each of the four years in the special education monitoring cycle, the LEAs selected for monitoring will include one "urban" LEA, one "medium rural" LEA, and two "small rural" LEAs. Because there are 6 LEAs in the "medium rural" subgroup, there will be two years in the four-year cycle that include 2 of these LEAs. (Note: This monitoring cycle concept was approved by OSEP in April 2008 as part of the Indicator 8 sampling description. See pp. 33-35 in the February 2010 SPP.)
 - all schools in the LEA have records selected for review (except Washoe County and Clark County, where size dictates selection); in Washoe County and Clark County, schools are selected to ensure a representative sample among elementary, middle, and high schools
 - record selection is stratified to ensure representation among race/ethnicity, disability, and placement categories in proportion to the LEA's total child count
- A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is required to address noncompliance found through NDE-facilitated review of records and policies/procedures/forms
 - CAPs are designed collaboratively between LEAs and the NDE
 - CAPs must include procedures for review and revision, if necessary, of policies and procedures, and the provision of

training to ensure that systemic noncompliance is corrected within one year

- LEAs must submit verification that CAP activities have been implemented as approved, and provide record review documentation to demonstrate correction of individual and systemic noncompliance

Data Management and Reporting

The NDE annually collects from its 18 LEAs (17 school districts and the state charter school authority). Child count and placement data are collected electronically on October 1, and software tools are used to search for duplicates, perform error checks, and prepare data for submission to EDFacts. The prepared data are uploaded to the Nevada State Education Accountability and Reporting System (NVSEARS) where the data are formatted for reports by the EDEN Coordinator for timely submissions. Assessment data are prepared by the NDE and formatted for reports by the EDEN Coordinator for timely submissions to EDFacts. Electronic submissions are provided by LEAs for exiting, discipline, personnel, dispute resolution, and MOE/CEIS data; the data are cleaned and prepared for submission to EDFacts or to EMAPS.

The NDE ensures that data are reported in a timely manner through implementing the following steps:

- instructions are sent to LEAs including excel spreadsheets for reporting data
- training is provided at meetings of the LEA special education directors, and specific targeted training is available as needed for local level staff
- deadlines are established for return of data to NDE
- NDE compiles data into various databases
- NDE uploads to NVSEARS (or directly to EMAPS)
- NDE Eden Coordinator submits files to EDFacts for timely submissions
- NDE provides necessary certifications and verifications

The NDE ensures that data are reported in an accurate manner through implementing the following steps:

- EDFacts or EMAPS flags errors and/or other significant changes in number or percentage over previous year
- NDE reviews local level data for obvious changes
- instructions are provided annually and aligned with OSEP instructions to states, as well as with EDFacts specs
- technical assistance is available in person or via telephone

The NDE ensures that LEAs collect and report data that is consistent with the federal requirements through implementing the following steps:

- procedures and timelines are established
- LEAs submit data in accordance with timelines or within approved extensions of time
- certifications/verifications are obtained with the submission of data
- data are aggregated and reported to EDFacts or EMAPS
- documentation (electronic and paper) is maintained
- errors are brought to the attention of LEAs so that immediate correction can be made and so that training and technical assistance may be provided to address systemic issues in reporting timely and accurate data

Fiscal Management

The NDE has recently undergone a comprehensive federal fiscal audit in connection with its utilization of ARRA funding and a separate audit conducted by the Office of the Inspector General. The NDE implements the following steps to ensure proper fiscal management in accordance with federal law:

- The NDE annually submits SEA eligibility documents to OSEP, including required assurances, descriptions of use of funds, and documentation of public participation; these materials are posted on the NDE website as required through the application development and finalization process.
- The LEAs annually submit LEA eligibility documents to the NDE, including required assurances, budgets for anticipated use of funds, excess cost calculations (maintained at local level), data regarding the voluntary use of federal funds for CEIS and data describing each LEAs compliance with the requirements for proportionate share funding to private school students.
- The NDE performs annual calculations of LEA subgrant base amounts and population and poverty allocations as part of entitlement funding.
- The NDE ensures annual distribution of LEA subgrant awards.
- The NDE conducts analysis of identification, placement, and discipline data to identify significant disproportionality.
- Annual reviews/audits are conducted of LEA subgrant award calculation, distribution, expenditures, maintenance of

effort, including the requirements of the Single Audit Act.

- Funds are timely liquidated at state and local levels.
- State level interagency agreements as necessary establish fiscal responsibility among noneducational public agencies.

Dispute Resolution

The NDE ensures establishment, maintenance and ongoing evaluation of the due process hearing system, including:

- adherence to timelines established in the IDEA
- data demonstrating the extent to which resolution sessions result in written settlement agreements
- technical assistance material available to the public and parents on the NDE website (including model forms and procedural safeguards)
- technical assistance training offered to LEAs, parents, advocates, and others regarding NDE's due process hearing procedures
- ongoing training of hearing and review officers (specific guidance is given for requiring correction of noncompliance within one year)
- ongoing system technical assistance and evaluation provided by an independent contractor, including evaluation surveys from system users

The NDE ensures establishment, maintenance, and evaluation of a state mediation system, including evaluation surveys from system users, data regarding the extent to which mediations result in agreements. Periodic training of mediators is provided regarding IDEA and Nevada law requirements, as well as mediation techniques.

The NDE ensures establishment, maintenance, and evaluation of a state complaint investigation system, including evaluation of timeliness. NDE tracks and analyzes issues to identify training and technical assistance needs for LEAs.

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The NDE's policies and procedures are established primarily through the Nevada Administrative Code, which is available on the NDE website. Effective implementation of the NAC and IDEA is ensured through the entire general supervision system, in particular the monitoring and dispute resolution systems. In addition LEAs provide annual assurances regarding policies, procedures, and implementation of IDEA and NAC requirements.

Technical Assistance System:

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

Technical Assistance System:

The NDE implements a comprehensive TA system that maximizes opportunities for face-to-face interactions and leverages technology to sustain the delivery of ongoing technical assistance and support. Intentional engagement occurs with special education leaders as well as with other district leaders who have a role to play in the performance of students with disabilities including superintendents, as well as directors of assessment/accountability, curriculum and instruction, career and technical education, and information technology. Bi-monthly, NDE leaders plan agendas, coordinate learning opportunities, and facilitate meetings that are routinely attended by the special education directors from each Nevada LEA. These meetings are designed to engage district leaders in learning about evidence-based practices for results (e.g., multi-tiered systems of support, formative assessment practices, universal design for learning, and others) as well as requirements for general supervision (e.g., fiscal issues, grant planning and administration, monitoring and compliance indicators, and so forth). In between these meetings, calls are routinely held, and emails are exchanged, among NDE and LEA personnel to address individualized TA needs.

Monthly, meetings are held with the superintendents from each LEA and attended by the State Superintendent and the Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement. At these meetings, dialogue occurs regarding student performance, including practices that the state and districts are implementing to support improved results in their schools. The performance of students with disabilities, and the evidence-based practices that LEAs are employing with regard to instruction, assessment, accountability, identification, and educator expectations and support are focused subjects of conversation during several meetings across the year. Meetings are also regularly scheduled to occur quarterly and in some cases, semi-annually, among district leaders across various programs such as assessment, accountability, curriculum and instruction, career and technical

education, special education, Title I, and Title III. Issues associated with results for special education students are addressed in these meetings, often as part of the LEAs' larger efforts to close achievement gaps for low performing students.

The Department also employs routine systems of information dissemination. The State Special Education Director transmits memos and email correspondence as needed to share information about legal requirements and best practices, including guiding LEA personnel to engage in webinars offered by the OSEP TA&D Network. State special education leaders are also engaged in cross-team efforts to build and sustain statewide systems that promote the implementation of evidence-based practices as part of the state's comprehensive approach to school and district improvement, under the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) and the aligned expectations of Nevada's ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Finally, the state utilizes meetings of the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as part of the TA system. The SEAC meets quarterly, and meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing of information, exchange of ideas, and to make requests of SEAC members to communicate with and share perspectives of the constituencies whom they represent.

Professional Development System:

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

Professional Development System:

Nevada maintains a comprehensive scheme of licensure, established by state law, designed to prepare teachers to meet the unique needs of students with various disabilities. See <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/NAC/NAC-391.html> for licenses and endorsements for teaching exceptional pupils.

The Nevada State Board of Education has adopted regulations that set forth the expectations which teachers and administrators are required to meet under the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). Teachers are expected to:

1. Connect the prior learning and experience of students to guide current learning
2. Assign tasks based upon the appropriate cognitive demands for students with diverse abilities
3. Require students to engage in learning through discourse and other strategies
4. Require students to engage in metacognitive activity
5. Integrate assessment into instruction

In order to support effective teaching and learning that results in positive student performance, school administrators are expected to create and sustain:

1. A focus on learning at the school
2. A school culture of striving for continuous improvement
3. Productive relationships
4. Structures to support an effective school

For both teachers and administrators, robust sets of indicators specify the measurable behaviors that exemplify these standards in practice. Significant resources have been invested to ensure that all teachers have the skills and knowledge to provide instruction, and all administrators have the instructional leadership capacity aligned to these standards and indicators, to create teaching and learning parameters that result in high achievement for all students. The states' system of Regional Professional Development Programs — a regional configuration of training entities — has been charged with providing opportunities for educators to learn the standards themselves, and to deepen their capacity to engage in practices that exemplify these standards. Trainings are provided at the school, district, regional, and statewide level, in partnership with LEAs. An aligned system of observation and other data collection mechanisms is in place to check for educator understanding and mastery of content. Systems of educator preparation and teacher and administrator licensure are being aligned to the standards to ensure that coherence across the state's systems of personnel development, accreditation, and professional development.

Additionally, at the systems level, the NDE annually hosts the Mega Conference, a statewide conference that draws hundreds of educators to gather for 2½ days of learning about long-standing practices as well as emerging strategies for successful teaching and learning. Every year, explicit attention is paid to ensuring that evidence based practices associated with teaching and learning for students with disabilities are substantially represented during the conference. NDE staff members also collaborate with the Nevada Association of School Administrators to provide training during functions offered across the state, three times per year.

Specifically targeted for special education leaders, the NDE also coordinates a three-day workshop each summer, where experts present on practices associated with standards, assessment, accountability, instruction, and educator development. Special education directors and their senior staff members listen, learn, exchange ideas, and deepen professional connections. They engage in action planning to develop strategies for implementing said evidence based practices in their home districts, which are then revisited in conversations with NDE staff across the year informally, and during specified opportunities in the bi-monthly meetings described under the state's TA approach, above.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate TARGET review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 33 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district and public charter school authority special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the TARGET document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

Reporting LEA Performance:

The process of LEAs toward the state targets is reported to the public by the end of May each year on the NDE website as follows:

LEA Annual Performance Reports:

http://www.doe.nv.gov/Special_Education/Reports/SE_Annual_Performance_Reports/2012-2013/

Reporting APR and SPP Documents to Public:

Following submission to OSEP and an opportunity for clarification, if necessary, the SPPs and APRs are made available to the public on the NDE website as follows:

State Annual Performance Reports:

http://www.doe.nv.gov/Special_Education/Reports/State_Annual_Performance_APR/

State Performance Plans:

http://www.doe.nv.gov/Special_Education/Reports/State_Performance_Plans_SPP/

Final documents are also made known to the media via press release and disseminated directly to an extensive list of interested parties.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		22.00%	80.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	23.30%	20.60%	16.30%	25.10%	23.40%	27.20%	23.50%	24.20%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	77.14%	83.76%	90.37%	97.00%	100%	100%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The stakeholders described in the Introduction acknowledged that the targets, even though high, must be the same as the targets for graduation with a regular diploma established for all students in the Title I ESEA waiver. Because these targets are the same as the AMO targets for graduation with a regular diploma in the ESEA waiver, the stakeholders supported these targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	797	
SY 2012-13 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/15/2014	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,015	
SY 2012-13 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/23/2014	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	26.43%	Calculate 

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2012 Data	FFY 2013 Target	FFY 2013 Data
797	3,015	24.20%	77.14%	26.43%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th

graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Graduation Rate Calculation under the ESEA in Nevada:

No difference exists between the conditions required of a youth with an IEP and a youth without an IEP to earn a regular diploma in Nevada. Nevada uses an "adjusted cohort graduation rate" to calculate high school graduation rates for the total student population. In the formula, the number of cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma (standard, advanced, and adult diplomas) are divided by the number of first-time 9th graders in fall of a given year (starting cohort) including students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die during that school year and the next three school years, through the summer of the fourth year. This formula is expressed as:

$$\frac{\text{\# of cohort members who earn a regular high school diploma}}{\text{\# of first-time 9th graders (starting cohort) including students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die during that school year and the next three school years, through the summer of the fourth year}}$$

Regular diplomas include standard, advanced, and adult diplomas.

Graduation data for 2012-13 IEP students:

IEP students earning regular diplomas in 2012-2013 = **797**

9th graders including students who transferred in during 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 through summer of 2013 = **3,979**

IEP students who transferred out, emigrated, or died during 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 through summer of 2013 = **964**

The calculation of the state's IEP adjusted cohort graduation rate for the 2012-2013 school year is:

$$\frac{(797)}{(3,979 - 964)} \times 100 = 26.43\%$$

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		7.40%	7.10%	6.80%	6.50%	6.20%	5.70%	5.60%
Data	8.00%	8.70%	9.20%	5.60%	5.70%	5.00%	4.40%	4.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Some SEAC stakeholders recommended lowering the target to 4.0% for FFY2013-2018, based on the actual data for FFY2012. After analyzing the actual data for FFY2013 showing the dropout rate had increased to 6.58%, and gathering further input from the SEDA stakeholder group, the NDE elected to continue to lower the target each year by 0.1% from FFY2013 through FFY 2018.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
873	13,272	4.00%	5.50%	6.58%

Use a different calculation methodology

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Dropout Rate Calculation:

The following formula defines how Nevada calculates a high school dropout rate. Total IEP Dropouts are determined through the student's withdrawal code and their program participation status. Total IEP Enrollment is the sum of students eligible for and receiving services under an IEP. Total IEP NonReturns are included in the Total IEP Dropouts and also added to the enrollment in the denominator as they are students expected to be in membership at the beginning of school (also known as summer dropouts).

In a given year, the formula is expressed as:

$$\frac{\text{Total IEP Dropouts}}{\text{Total IEP Enrollment} + \text{Total IEP NonReturns}} \times 100$$

Withdrawal Codes that Qualify as a "Dropout" Withdrawal:

Dropouts are determined by the student’s withdrawal code. The following reasons for withdrawal qualify as a dropout.

W3(a)i	Credit deficiency;
W3(a)ii	Pregnancy;
W3(a)iii	Marriage;
W3(a)iv	Employment;
W3(a)v	Student has long term medical condition, or in drug treatment or a rehabilitative setting that prevents them from receiving services (NRS 392.050);
W3(a)vi	Authorization by juvenile division for the district court pursuant to NRS 392.090;
W3(a)vii	Self-supported or parental support in accordance with NRS 392.100;
W3(a)viii	Apprenticeship in accordance with NRS 392.110;
W3(a)ix	Any other reason not specified in paragraphs 3(a)i through 3(a)viii, inclusive.
W3(b)	Student withdrawn because age exceeds age restrictions.
W3(c)i	Permanent expulsion;
W3(c)ii	Disciplinary or other eligibility reasons; or
W3(c)iii	Incarceration.
W3(d)i	Student withdrawn to GED program; or
W3(d)ii	Student withdrawn to adult vocational/technical program.
W3(e)i	Absence of the student for 10 consecutive days and whose whereabouts are unknown;
W3(e)ii	Absence of the student for the entire month with no expected date of return; or
W3(e)iii	Unexplained absence as set forth in NAC 387.220.
W3(g)	Attendance excused for distance residence from nearest school (NRS 392.080).

Dropout Data for 2012-2013 IEP students:

Total IEP Dropouts = **873**

Total IEP Enrollment = **13,070**

Total IEP NonReturns = **202**

The calculation of the state’s IEP dropout rate for the 2012-2013 school year is:

$$\frac{873}{(13,070 + 202)} \times 100 = 6.58\%$$

Explanation of Slippage

During 2012-2013, LEAs in the state began implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Students with disabilities are particularly challenged by the rigorous academic standards and pacing associated with the curriculum used to implement the CCSS. Students also continue to be measured using the High School Proficiency Examination (HSPE), which is aligned to previous standards and curriculum but not to the CCSS. In addition, as the economy recovers in Nevada, there is

a rebounding availability of service industry jobs with limited entry level skills that tend to attract young people, and an increase in the number of unskilled service positions that do not require investment in further education. Because students have more jobs available to them, and a diminishing expectation that they can earn a regular high school diploma, the number of students counted as a dropout for purposes of this calculation has increased.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		85.70%	85.70%	88.90%	87.50%	87.50%	87.50%	87.50%
Data	87.50%	100%	100%	37.50%	30.80%	87.50%	55.50%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing a target that would allow only of the 10 districts who meet the minimum "n" size requirement to fail to meet AMOs for student achievement.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP? Yes No
 Are you reporting AYP or AMO? AYP AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
18	10	0	0%	90.00%	0%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	97.30%	98.60%	98.80%	98.80%	98.90%	99.00%	99.20%	98.80%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data	97.70%	98.80%	98.90%	98.80%	99.00%	98.90%	99.20%	98.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders acknowledged that the 95% participation rate target is consistent with the participation rate required for all students under the Title I ESEA waiver. Consequently, the stakeholders supported the 95% participation rate target for FFY2013-2018.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	4093	4076	3950	3920	3677	3588	0	0	2984	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2467	2400	2289	2074	1847	1872			1423		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	890	959	1042	1204	1263	1150			1193		

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	483	430	366	388	336	307			249		

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	4093	4076	3950	3919	3677	3588	0	0	2984	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1344	1139	1023	1007	799	868			749		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2006	2213	2324	2247	2280	2212			1865		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	477	427	366	383	337	306			250		

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	26,288	24,632	98.80%	95.00%	93.70%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

For the first time since Nevada began reporting data under this Indicator, the state did not meet the 95% target. The lower percentage appears to be the result of an assessment data submission that did not include "participant" numbers for students who participated in SBAC pilot testing in 2013-2014 but were not required to also participate in the regular (and alternate) state assessments. Permission not to "double test" these students was obtained from the U.S. Department of Education, but because no valid scores were obtained for students who participated in the SBAC pilot, they were not included as participants (but were included as enrolled). The NDE is continuing to work with the U.S. Department of Education to resolve this issue.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Overall	26,287	24,622	98.70%	95.00%	93.67%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

For the first time since Nevada began reporting data under this Indicator, the state did not meet the 95% target. The lower percentage appears to be the result of an assessment data submission that did not include "participant" numbers for students who participated in SBAC pilot testing in 2013-2014 but were not required to also participate in the regular (and alternate) state assessments. Permission not to "double test" these students was obtained from the U.S. Department of Education, but because no valid scores were obtained for students who participated in the SBAC pilot, they were not included as participants (but were included as enrolled). The NDE is continuing to work with the U.S. Department of Education to resolve this issue.

Public Reporting Information

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

<http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/main/assessment>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		26.50%	28.00%	29.50%	31.00%	32.50%	34.00%	35.50%
			Data	25.70%	33.10%	30.90%	31.10%	33.30%	33.00%	31.40%	32.50%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥		27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%
			Data	25.80%	28.60%	28.10%	30.40%	31.80%	30.60%	33.50%	31.60%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		21.50%	23.00%	24.50%	26.00%	27.50%	29.00%	30.50%
			Data	14.10%	21.70%	19.00%	21.40%	23.80%	25.00%	25.30%	26.00%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥		21.00%	22.00%	23.00%	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%
			Data	20.20%	19.90%	23.70%	22.60%	25.60%	18.30%	19.50%	20.90%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥		18.00%	19.00%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%	23.00%	24.00%
			Data	17.30%	25.60%	24.20%	29.70%	30.70%	15.80%	16.00%	18.50%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		19.50%	20.50%	21.50%	22.50%	23.50%	24.50%	25.50%
			Data	16.00%	17.80%	19.20%	21.70%	25.70%	11.10%	13.90%	12.20%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥		27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%
			Data	30.10%	36.70%	36.40%	61.50%	67.50%	69.30%	34.60%	34.00%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥		34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%
			Data	30.50%	34.80%	36.90%	35.90%	42.60%	45.80%	45.80%	40.40%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥		32.00%	33.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%
			Data	30.80%	38.00%	40.20%	37.70%	39.80%	42.00%	44.10%	39.40%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥		26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%
			Data	23.80%	28.20%	30.60%	31.50%	35.80%	37.20%	37.40%	33.40%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥		25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%
			Data	23.00%	23.20%	27.00%	30.30%	28.30%	30.10%	35.30%	16.00%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥		18.00%	19.00%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%	23.00%	24.00%
			Data	17.30%	21.70%	21.90%	26.40%	26.50%	30.70%	33.80%	17.00%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥		18.50%	20.00%	21.50%	23.00%	24.50%	26.00%	27.50%
			Data	15.00%	17.40%	19.10%	19.30%	21.50%	20.70%	23.70%	11.10%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥		15.50%	17.00%	18.50%	20.00%	21.50%	23.00%	24.50%
			Data	11.60%	15.10%	16.10%	28.00%	32.10%	31.60%	34.80%	33.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	37.00%	38.50%	40.00%	41.50%	43.00%	44.50%
	B ≥ Grade 4	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	32.00%	33.50%	35.00%	36.50%	38.00%	39.50%
	D ≥ Grade 6	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	26.50%	27.50%	28.50%	29.50%	30.50%	31.50%
	G ≥ Grade 11	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%	44.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	32.00%	33.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	29.00%	30.50%	32.00%	33.50%	35.00%	36.50%
	G ≥ Grade 11	26.00%	27.50%	29.00%	30.50%	32.00%	33.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing incremental increases in the targets for student achievement that align to the incremental increases for FFY2005-2012.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? **yes**

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? **yes**

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	3840	3789	3697	3666	3446	3329	0	0	2865	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	779	731	582	418	331	206			773		

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	115	149	182	132	137	75			671		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	348	262	195	218	190	158	0	0	164	0	0

Data Source: SY 2013-14 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/18/2014

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	3827	3779	3713	3637	3416	3386	0	0	2864	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	765	652	468	267	194	102			699		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	433	524	458	160	203	74			1763		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	180	199	200	221	197	162	0	0	209	0	0

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	3,840	1,242	32.50%	37.00%	32.34%
B Grade 4	3,789	1,142	31.60%	34.00%	30.14%
C Grade 5	3,697	959	26.00%	32.00%	25.94%
D Grade 6	3,666	768	20.90%	28.00%	20.95%

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
E Grade 7	3,446	658	18.50%	25.00%	19.09%
F Grade 8	3,329	439	12.20%	26.50%	13.19%
G Grade 11	2,865	1,608	34.00%	34.00%	56.13%

Explanation of Group B Slippage

In general, decreased performance is related to increased academic and performance standards. During 2013-2014, LEAs continued implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Students with disabilities are particularly challenged by the rigorous academic standards and pacing associated with the curriculum used to implement the CCSS. Students also continue to be measured using assessments that are aligned to previous standards and curriculum, rather than to the CCSS.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A Grade 3	3,827	1,378	40.40%	48.00%	36.01%
B Grade 4	3,779	1,375	39.40%	39.00%	36.39%
C Grade 5	3,713	1,126	33.40%	40.00%	30.33%
D Grade 6	3,637	648	16.00%	32.00%	17.82%
E Grade 7	3,416	594	17.00%	25.00%	17.39%
F Grade 8	3,386	338	11.10%	29.00%	9.98%
G Grade 11	2,864	2,671	33.80%	26.00%	93.26%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

In general, decreased performance is related to increased academic and performance standards. During 2013-2014, LEAs continued implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Students with disabilities are particularly challenged by the rigorous academic standards and pacing associated with the curriculum used to implement the CCSS. Students also continue to be measured using assessments that are aligned to previous standards and curriculum, rather than to the CCSS.

Explanation of Group B Slippage

In general, decreased performance is related to increased academic and performance standards. During 2013-2014, LEAs continued implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Students with disabilities are particularly challenged by the rigorous academic standards and pacing associated with the curriculum used to implement the CCSS. Students also continue to be measured using assessments that are aligned to previous standards and curriculum, rather than to the CCSS.

Explanation of Group C Slippage

In general, decreased performance is related to increased academic and performance standards. During 2013-2014, LEAs continued implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Students with disabilities are particularly challenged by the rigorous academic standards and pacing associated with the curriculum used to implement the CCSS. Students also continue to be measured using assessments that are aligned to previous standards and curriculum, rather than to the CCSS.

Explanation of Group F Slippage

In general, decreased performance is related to increased academic and performance standards. During 2013-2014, LEAs continued implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Students with disabilities are particularly challenged by the rigorous academic standards and pacing associated with the curriculum used to implement the CCSS. Students also continue to be measured using assessments that are aligned to previous standards and curriculum, rather than to the CCSS.

Public Reporting Information

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

<http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/main/assessment>

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≤		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	5.90%	5.90%	5.90%	5.90%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing the targets at 0% for FFY2013-2018.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	1	0%	0%	0%

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

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Nevada compares LEA rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability.

An LEA has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least five percentage

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

points more than the state’s average suspension expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (the “statewide bar”).

The statewide bar is calculated by dividing the statewide total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days in a school year by the statewide total number of students with disabilities, and adding five percentage points.

Nevada uses a minimum “n” size requirement to exclude LEAs from the calculation if the LEA has fewer than 25 students with disabilities who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year.

LEA rates are calculated by dividing the LEA’s total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days by the total number of students with disabilities in the LEA.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Not applicable. The state was not required to complete a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY2013 because 0% of districts had a significant discrepancy in FFY2012 in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.



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



The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	1	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Nevada compares LEA rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities in each race/ethnic category to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability.

An LEA has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities, in any race/ethnic category, is at least five percentage points more than the state's average suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (the "statewide bar"). The statewide bar is calculated by dividing the statewide total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days in a school year by the statewide total number of students with disabilities, and adding five percentage points. Nevada uses a minimum "n" size requirement to exclude LEAs from the calculation if the LEA has fewer than 25 students with disabilities, in any race/ethnic category, who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year.

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

LEA rates are calculated by dividing the LEA's total number of students with disabilities, by race/ethnic category, suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days by the total number of students with disabilities in the LEA, by race/ethnic category.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

FFY 2012 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY2013 using 2012-2013 data)

Description of review

Not applicable. The state was not required to complete a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY2013 because 0% of districts had a significant discrepancy in FFY2012, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2005	Target ≥		54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%
		Data	63.80%	58.90%	60.70%	62.70%	63.40%	64.20%	64.30%	63.90%
B	2005	Target ≤		15.60%	15.50%	15.40%	15.30%	15.20%	15.10%	15.00%
		Data	15.60%	13.20%	13.00%	12.80%	13.40%	13.70%	13.90%	14.20%
C	2005	Target ≤		1.70%	1.70%	1.70%	1.70%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%
		Data	2.00%	1.70%	1.70%	1.70%	1.90%	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%
Target B ≤	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%
Target C ≤	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Some stakeholders recommended raising the target for 5-A to 64% for FFY2013-2018, based on the actual data for FFY2012. Other stakeholders recommended more modest increases consistent with the 1% increase per year in previous years. After analyzing the actual data for FFY2005-2012, and considering slippage in other indicators of academic success, the NDE elected to increase the target to 62% for FFY2013 and FFY2014, to 63% for FFY2015 and FFY2016, and to 64% for FFY2017 and FFY2018.

Stakeholders supported maintaining the FFY2012 targets for 5-B and 5-C for FFY2013-2018, based on the fact that Nevada's percentages are already lower than the national average, and setting targets too low can compromise IDEA principles related to having a continuum of placements available to meet the unique needs of students.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	43,811	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	28,151	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,226	

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	509	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	4	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/3/2014	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	132	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	28,151	43,811	63.90%	62.00%	64.26%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,226	43,811	14.20%	15.00%	14.21%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	645	43,811	1.50%	1.60%	1.47%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2011	Target ≥								23.70%
		Data							23.50%	21.80%
B	2011	Target ≤								54.30%
		Data							54.60%	59.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	23.70%	23.70%	24.70%	24.70%	25.70%	25.70%
Target B ≤	54.30%	54.30%	53.30%	53.30%	52.30%	52.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing the FFY2012 targets for 6-A and 6-B for FFY2013 and FFY2014, then increasing the target for 6-A by 1% in FFY2015 and FFY2016 and by another 1% in FFY2017 and FFY2018. Stakeholders also supported decreasing the target for 6-B by 1% in FFY2015 and FFY2016 and by another 1% in FFY2017 and FFY2018.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,241	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,850	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,837	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b2. Number of children attending separate school	245	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/3/2014	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,850	8,241	21.80%	23.70%	22.45%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,082	8,241	59.10%	54.30%	61.67%

Explanation of B Slippage

Currently, all of the state-funded preschool sites include children with disabilities in their programs. However, Nevada does not have universal preschool and only serves approximately 1.7% of three- and four-year olds in state-funded preschools, which limits opportunities for inclusive placement options. LEAs have been creating new inclusive classrooms to provide opportunities for students with disabilities, but these programs have not been developed quickly enough to keep up with growth in the numbers of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5. LEAs have also continued to develop relationships with community-based preschool programs, but in rural areas of the state, there are almost no private preschools available. Additionally, some of the private preschools that did exist in urban areas have closed due to economic reasons, eliminating those options for inclusion.

The NDE has also been engaged with LEAs in a continual effort to ensure that data collected are valid and reliable. In this regard, some LEAs in the past were calculating Indicator 6 incorrectly. Technical assistance has been provided and the accuracy of the data has improved.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A1	2013	Target ≥					73.40%	74.40%	75.40%	76.40%
		Data				73.40%	79.50%	80.60%	76.70%	81.10%
A2	2013	Target ≥					73.70%	74.70%	75.70%	76.70%
		Data				73.70%	76.20%	70.70%	60.60%	57.80%
B1	2013	Target ≥					72.10%	73.10%	74.10%	75.10%
		Data				72.10%	74.10%	85.40%	78.80%	78.90%
B2	2013	Target ≥					65.80%	66.80%	67.80%	68.80%
		Data				65.80%	54.20%	60.80%	55.80%	52.90%
C1	2013	Target ≥					75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%
		Data				75.00%	78.40%	86.80%	75.60%	73.10%
C2	2013	Target ≥					76.80%	77.80%	78.80%	79.80%
		Data				76.80%	77.10%	82.20%	66.30%	61.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	76.40%	76.40%	78.50%	78.50%	80.60%	80.60%
Target A2 ≥	57.13%	57.13%	58.22%	58.22%	59.31%	59.31%
Target B1 ≥	75.10%	75.10%	77.85%	77.85%	80.60%	86.60%
Target B2 ≥	54.14%	54.14%	55.07%	55.07%	56.00%	56.00%
Target C1 ≥	78.00%	78.00%	79.15%	79.15%	80.30%	80.30%
Target C2 ≥	60.32%	60.32%	62.96%	62.96%	65.60%	65.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Regarding Summary Statement 1 (Targets A1, B1, C1), stakeholders recommended continuing FFY2012 targets in FFY2013, then increasing the targets every two years to reach approximate national averages by FFY2017 and FFY2018.

Regarding Summary Statement 2, stakeholders recommended resetting baselines and lowering targets from the FFY2012 levels to better align Nevada's targets with the national averages. A considerable amount of data was presented to the stakeholder groups to support lowering these targets and resetting baselines. The data and rationale are as follows:

1. The targets set by Nevada for FFY2012 were unreasonably higher than the national average: (PSR) was 17.7% higher than the national average; (KS) was 15.88% higher than the national average; and (AMN) was 14.8% higher than the national average.

2. The actual FFY2012 performance was comparable to the national average: (PSR) was 1.16% under the national average; (KS) was 0.08% under the national average; and (AMN) was 3.09% under the national average.
3. The actual FFY2013 performance as also comparable to the national average: (PSR) was 2.17% under the national average; (KS) was 1.14% over the national average; and (AMN) was 5.28% under the national average.

The performance for Summary Statement 2 has been very stable for the past two years, suggesting that the data are increasingly valid and reliable. The data that were used prior to the 2009-2010 school year was hand entered into a spreadsheet used to calculate the outcomes and determine improvement strategies. The data collected from those years lacked accuracy, completeness, and reliability. Beginning that year, the NDE invested in a web-based, secure system (Nevada Special Education Accountability and Reporting System -- NVSEARS) to gather and compute the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. The system has built-in features that flag any incomplete or non-allowable data, making the data much more accurate and reliable. Additionally, functions have been added to the system to allow for analysis of the data, including a trend analysis function. These features have contributed to stability in the data, but because the data are increasingly reliable, the data now show decreases in performance (which is often the case as data are more accurately reported).

To summarize, Nevada's targets established in FFY2009 were based on baseline data from FFY2008 that were less accurate and reliable than the data collected through NVSEARS. Since that time, the combination of technical assistance and an improved data collection system has provided data that better reflects the state's results. The comparison of our current targets to the national averages also led us to the conclusion that the targets were unreasonably high and that the baseline needed to be reset.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3,238
--	-------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	145
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	412
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	831
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,209
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	641

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,040	2,597	81.10%	76.40%	78.55%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,850	3,238	57.80%	57.13%	57.13%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	191
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	438

	Number of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	856
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,257
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	496

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2,113	2,742	78.90%	75.10%	77.06%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,753	3,238	52.90%	54.14%	54.14%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	302
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	380
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	603
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,169
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	784

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1,772	2,454	73.10%	78.00%	72.21%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1,953	3,238	61.90%	60.32%	60.32%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

See FFY 2013 data on previous page.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%
Data	71.20%	68.20%	71.70%	74.00%	76.00%	74.00%	76.00%	74.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing 78% as the target for FFY2013-2018.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
965	1,270	74.00%	78.00%	75.98%

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

The data are collected for children with disabilities in preschool in the same way as the data are collected for school age children with disabilities.

The parents of all students with disabilities for each LEA (except Clark County School District and Washoe County School District) are surveyed in the year that the LEA is selected for on-site monitoring, including the parents of all children with disabilities ages three through five. For Clark and Washoe school districts, the samples are created to be representative of the age, ethnicity, and disability category for the entire population of students with disabilities in those districts, including children with disabilities in preschools.

There are no threats to validity or reliability for the preschool surveys that are any different than from the school age surveys. Validity and reliability is a concern at any time that the responding population is not representative of the surveyed population.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

For information concerning how Nevada ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, see the section below entitled "Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates."

Survey Sample Response Rate

During FFY2013, parent surveys were disseminated to all students with disabilities in four districts scheduled for a comprehensive monitoring visit (Churchill, Esmeralda, Lincoln, and Washoe). In addition, a sample was selected for parent survey in Clark County School District because this district has an average daily membership (ADM) of more than 50,000 students.

Surveys were successfully sent to 8,503 parents, and a total of 1,326 responses were received for a 15.6% response rate (1,326/8,503 = 15.6%). This response rate exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines (e.g., <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>).

Representativeness of Survey Results -- How the Data Represents the Demographics of the State

In order to examine the representativeness of the respondents in the FFY2013 parent survey, student-level data regarding grade level, disability category, and race/ethnic category are collected for each survey response. Then, the grade level, disability category, and race/ethnic category data for survey responses are compared to the grade level, disability category, and race/ethnic category data in the October 1, 2013, child count of students ages 3-21 in the surveyed districts.

Representativeness by Disability Category

The National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) has stated that when representativeness is outside the +/- 3% range, the lack of representativeness is important. When comparing the representativeness within disability categories, Nevada's survey respondents in most categories are well within the NPSO acceptable range. See the following data:

- 3.9% students with intellectual disabilities in child count, compared to 5% in child survey
- 14.2% students with speech/language impairment in child count, compared to 15% in survey
- 3% students with emotional disturbance in child count, compared to 3% in survey
- 8% students with health impairment in child count, compared to 10% in survey
- 11.2% students with developmental delay in child count, compared to 11% in survey
- 10.5% students with autism in child count, compared to 14% in survey

Approximately 36% of the responding parents were parents of children with learning disabilities, compared to 43.8% in the child count. This represents a 7.8-point gap, which has been reduced considerably from the 10-point gap in FFY2012.

Representativeness by Race/Ethnic Category

Analysis of the race/ethnicity representativeness showed a very close representativeness (within the +/- 3% range) in categories for American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races. In the other three categories, the analysis showed larger gaps in representativeness.

- 40.5% students in Hispanic category in child count, compared to 34% in survey (6.5 point gap) (6.3 point gap in FFY2012)
- 14.9% Black/African American category in child count, compared to 7% in survey (7.9 point gap) (8.7 point gap in FFY2012)
- 34.3% White category in child count, compared to 46% in survey (11.7 point gap) (13 point gap in FFY2012)

The gap for students in the Hispanic category remained virtually the same, but significant improvement occurred in the gaps for Black/African American and White categories.

Representativeness by Grade Level

Analysis of the grade category representativeness showed a close representativeness between PreK groups in the child count (9.6%) and in the survey (10%) suggesting that preschool parent survey data are representative of the PreK population in these school districts.

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

Nevada's sampling plan was approved in the submission of the original SPP in December 2005, and has not changed.

Population Represented

Parents of students with disabilities in Washoe and Clark County School Districts will be sampled to represent the entire population of students with disabilities in those two school districts (i.e., the Washoe sample will represent the entire population of students with disabilities in the Washoe County School District).

Ensuring a Representative Sample

Because the NDE will sample from within each of the two largest school districts (Washoe and Clark) in each year, the sample will be representative of the population it is trying to represent (i.e., parents of students with disabilities in those districts).

Sampling Methods

The sample will be stratified to represent not only each district's population in terms of disability category, but also race/ethnicity and grade group. Because parents will be selected based upon the characteristics of their children (disability category, grade group, and race/ethnicity), the sample is expected to be the same as the population of students with disabilities in the district.

Specific Sampling Procedures

The NDE will use stratified sampling to ensure that a sample representative of the parents of all students with disabilities in the district is surveyed. Stratified sampling is a commonly used probability method that is superior to random sampling, particularly when a subset of the population has low incidence relative to other segments of the population. This method will be useful when sampling among low-incidence disability categories, such as students with vision and hearing impairments. Assistance in assuring a high quality stratified sample will be provided by Piedra Data, a NCSEAM-recommended vendor.

Method/Process for Data Collection

The NCSEAM survey will be used to collect data on the percent of parents who report that their children's schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. The survey will be mailed to families and an Internet version will also be made available to parents who choose to complete the survey online.

Addressing Problems

Acknowledging that low survey response rates pose problems when drawing inferences about the population as a whole, the NDE will take the following steps to ensure that valid and reliable information is obtained:

- First, the NDE will work with Piedra Data and Scantron, Inc. to identify the number of responses that are necessary to reasonably draw inferences about the population. In order to ensure sufficient responses, the NDE will over-sample, and then weight responses as necessary.
- Assuming that the NCSEAM survey addresses the common flaws in survey question design (unclear questions, providing a postage stamp on the return envelope, etc.), the NDE will work with Nevada PEP (the state's federally funded Parent Training and Information Center) to develop correspondence and other media communications encouraging parents to respond to the survey, and advising parents to seek assistance from Nevada PEP if they are unclear about any aspect of the survey.
- Incomplete surveys will be followed up with additional mailings.
- A Spanish version of the survey will be used as an option for parents, and more than one method (paper and pencil as well as internet) will be available for parent response.
- Because sampling will only occur in the two largest school districts (Clark and Washoe), no violations of confidentiality are anticipated.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

See section on previous page entitled "Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the state" for information related to whether the FFY2013 data are from

a group representative of the population. Although the representativeness continues to improve, work remains to be done to ensure a more representative sample of respondents according to race/ethnic categories. The NDE will work specifically with the vendor to analyze the FFY2013 data in order to develop specific strategies to oversample to increase the responses from Hispanic and Black/African American groups.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	16	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

A weighted risk ratio analysis is used to identify disproportionate over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education for seven race/ethnic groups (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races). Disproportionate over-representation will be identified when the weighted risk ratio is 3.0 or greater for three consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in which there are at least twenty-five students in the special education population within the LEA (the minimum "n" size requirement). This analysis results in the identification of LEAs with disproportionate over-representation possibly resulting from inappropriate identification.

Two LEAs had a weighted risk ratio of 3.0 or greater but both were excluded from the calculation as a result of the state's minimum "n" size requirement.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

Number of districts in the State

Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	2	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

A weighted risk ratio analysis is used to identify disproportionate over-representation within each race/ethnicity category for the following disability categories:

- Intellectual disabilities
- Specific learning disabilities
- Emotional disturbance
- Speech or language impairments
- Other health impairments
- Autism

A weighted risk ratio analysis is used to identify disproportionate over-representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education for seven race/ethnic groups (Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American,

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races). Disproportionate over-representation is identified when the weighted risk ratio is 3.0 or greater for three consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group in which there are at least 25 students in a particular disability category within the LEA (the minimum "n" size). This analysis results in the identification of LEAs with possible disproportionate over-representation resulting from inappropriate identification.

Exclusion of LEAs During FFY2013

During FFY2013, the following numbers of LEAs had weighted risk ratios of 3.0 or greater for a particular race/ethnic category in a particular disability category, but were excluded from the calculation as a result of the state's minimum "n" size requirement:

- Emotional Disturbance: 8 LEAs were excluded (7 with cell sizes containing 13 or fewer students)
- Other Health Impairment: 6 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 14 or fewer students)
- Intellectual Disabilities: 10 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 7 or fewer students)
- Specific Learning Disabilities: 4 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 12 or fewer students)
- Speech or Language Impairments: 3 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 12 or fewer students)
- Autism: 9 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 6 or fewer students)

The total "unduplicated" number of LEAs that were excluded from the calculation was 16.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	76.40%	83.00%	95.60%	87.20%	100%	100%	100%	94.40%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
27	26	94.40%	100%	96.30%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	1
---	---

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

One student's initial evaluation was conducted four (4) calendar days beyond the 45-school-day timeline, due to a staff member's need to reschedule the meeting.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

These data are collected as part of annual state monitoring. See "Monitoring" subsection in "General Supervision" section in INTRODUCTION. Each year, each record reviewed is monitored to determine whether the student's initial evaluation was conducted within 45 school days of the date that the student's parent signed the consent for the student's evaluation.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

During FFY2012, four districts (Clark, Lyon, Pershing, Storey) were selected for a comprehensive record review as part of Nevada's four-year monitoring cycle. A noncompliance finding for failure to complete initial evaluations within 45 school days was issued for Clark County School District. All identified was corrected within one year, as described below.

Verification that each District is Correctly Implementing Regulatory Requirements

To verify correction at the system level, Clark County School District collected and reported data from September 2013 through March 2014 verifying that students initially referred for evaluations received timely evaluations during the 2013-2014 school year, with no noncompliance.

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

Verification that each District has Completed the Initial Evaluation, Although Late

For each of the 6 students in Clark County School District whose evaluations exceeded 45 school days, their initial evaluations were completed and their eligibility determinations had been made by the time the records were reviewed during the on-site monitoring. Consequently, within the 2012-2013 school year, the noncompliance for these 6 students was already corrected and they were receiving services in accordance with their IEPs.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	83.90%	81.00%	73.90%	100%	99.20%	98.00%	100%	99.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	381
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	69
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	278
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	30
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	278	282	99.30%	100%	98.58%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	4
--	---

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

Four school districts were selected for monitoring during FFY2013. In one school district, eligibility was determined for four children referred by Part C beyond the children's third birthday, due to staff scheduling difficulties. The number of days beyond the third birthday ranged from 2 to 8.

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

 State monitoring

 State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Nevada has a four-year monitoring cycle and each LEA is selected for monitoring in one of the four years. See "Monitoring" subsection in "General Supervision" section in INTRODUCTION. Each LEA selected for monitoring in a given school year submits data for the entire reporting year with necessary elements to complete the calculation required for Indicator 12. Follow-up inquiries are made as needed to clarify any questions that arise during data analysis.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

During FFY2012, four districts (Clark, Lyon, Pershing, Storey) were selected for a comprehensive record review as part of Nevada's four-year monitoring cycle. A noncompliance finding for failure to have an IEP developed and implemented by the child's third birthday was issued for Storey County School District. All identified noncompliance was corrected within one year, as described below.

Verification that each District is Correctly Implementing Regulatory Requirements

To verify correction at the system level, Storey County School District collected and reported data from September 2013 through March 2014 verifying that students referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Verification that each District has Developed and Implemented the IEP, Although Late

For the one student in Storey County School District whose IEP was not developed and implemented by the child's third birthday, the IEP had been developed and implemented by the time the records were reviewed during the on-site monitoring. Consequently, within the 2012-2013 school year, the noncompliance for this one child was already corrected and the child was receiving services in accordance with the child's IEP.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					92.90%	100%	91.67%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
21	23	100%	100%	91.30%

Explanation of Slippage

During FFY2013, 91.30% of student records included evidence of all required secondary transition components. The single component missing from two students' files in Washoe County School District was evidence that an appropriate agency representative was invited to the student's IEP meeting after obtaining prior consent. Because this calculation is based on the on-site monitoring findings in a different set of school districts in each year of a four-year cycle, the comparison to the compliance percentage in the previous year is not a comparison to the same districts.

Nevada has invested in training and technical assistance to districts to ensure that transition components are well understood and appropriately implemented. Specific training has occurred at the teacher level in Washoe County School District to explain exactly what processes must be engaged and what documentation is required to comply with the secondary transition provisions in the IDEA. Although slippage has occurred, local school districts now maintain a high level of compliance with these complex transition components.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

These data are collected as part of annual state monitoring. See "Monitoring" subsection in "General Supervision" section in INTRODUCTION. Each year, each record for students ages 16 and older is monitored to determine whether each of the required secondary transition components is in place.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Not applicable.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2009	Target ≥						25.00%	26.00%	27.00%
		Data					24.00%	20.00%	18.00%	24.00%
B	2009	Target ≥						54.00%	55.00%	56.00%
		Data					53.00%	44.00%	50.00%	54.00%
C	2009	Target ≥						70.00%	71.00%	72.00%
		Data					69.00%	62.00%	67.00%	66.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	28.00%	28.00%
Target B ≥	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	57.00%	57.00%	57.00%
Target C ≥	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	73.00%	73.00%	73.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing the FFY2012 targets for the three years from FFY2013 through FFY2015, and then increasing each category (A, B, C) by 1% for the three years from FFY2016 through FFY2018.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,108
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	237
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	384
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	83
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	69

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
--	----------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

		longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	237	1,108	24.00%	27.00%	21.39%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	621	1,108	54.00%	56.00%	56.05%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	773	1,108	66.00%	72.00%	69.77%

Explanation of A Slippage

Slippage in the number of students with disabilities in Nevada enrolled in higher education one year after leaving high school is related to the following factors:

1. Increased costs in attending postsecondary institutions
2. Increased admissions requirements at postsecondary institutions
3. Decreased outreach by postsecondary institutions to students with disabilities (due in part to the inability to access federal financial aid and/or inability to seek a degree or certificate with an Adjusted Diploma)

Students in Nevada who graduate with an Adjusted Diploma have been unable to access Federal Financial Aid since July 1, 2012, negatively impacting their ability to enroll in higher education.

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

In the FFY 2013 APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2013 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Survey Response Rates

During FFY2013, surveys of students with disabilities who exited secondary school during 2012-2013 were provided to 2,837 students. Data were collected from 1,108 respondents, for a response rate of 39.1% (1,108/2,837 = 39.1%). This response rate is comparable to the FFY2012 response rate.

Representativeness of Responses

Disability Category

Respondents were compared to the original survey population to determine the representativeness of the responding students when compared to the surveyed students, using the Response Calculator developed by the National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) Center. Representativeness was compared by disability category for students with learning disabilities, students with emotional disturbance, and students with intellectual disabilities, with the following results.

- 69% of the students surveyed had learning disabilities; 67% of the respondents had learning disabilities
- 7% of the students surveyed had emotional disturbance; 5.5% of the respondents had emotional disturbance
- 5% of the students surveyed had intellectual disabilities; 4% of the respondents had intellectual disabilities

In FFY2013, differences between the survey group and the respondent group for each disability category were less than the +/- 3% range identified by NPSO as important.

Race/Ethnic Category

Students were also compared for representativeness according to minority (non-White) category, with the following results.

- 61.6% of the students surveyed were minority students (non-White); 54.2% of the respondents were minority students (non-White) (7.4 point gap)

The 7.4 point gap between the minority students surveyed and those who responded represents slippage from FFY2012 when the gap was 5 points.

Gender and ELL Categories

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Students were also compared for representativeness according to gender and ELL status, with the following results.

- 35% of the students surveyed were female; 35.5% of the respondents were female
- 65% of the students surveyed were male; 64.5% of the respondents were male
- 14% of the students were English Language Learners; 12% of the respondents were English Language Learners

Dropouts

19% of the students surveyed were dropouts; 9% of the respondents were dropouts.

Summary

Although the representativeness continues to improve, work remains to be done to ensure a more representative sample of respondents in the minority and dropout categories. The NDE will work specifically with the vendor to analyze the FFY2013 data in order to develop specific strategies to oversample to increase the responses from students in the minority and dropout categories.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	91.00%	67.00%	48.00%	44.00%	38.00%	56.50%	68.57%	79.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing the targets at 85%.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	58	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2014	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	89	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
58	89	79.75%	85.00%	65.17%

Explanation of Slippage

As discussed in previous Annual Performance Reports, written resolution settlement agreements are not the only means for settling disputes. During 2013-2014, of the 98 total hearing requests received, 96 were resolved without a hearing, and two went to hearing (after 7/30/14). Consequently, Nevada's actual resolution rate was 98%. This overall resolution rate is significant—it suggests that although resolution sessions per se may not always result in written settlement agreements, there are various other means that are successfully used in Nevada to resolve disputes without due process hearings. If resolution session "success" is declining or increasing in any particular year, it means nothing more than that school districts and parents are using other effective means to resolve disputes, and the NDE has no particular interest in valuing one particular dispute resolution mechanism over another.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	80.00%	100%	100%	33.33%	66.70%		100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders supported continuing the target at 80% for FFY2013-2018.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0	
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	2	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1	0	2	100%	80.00%	50.00%

Explanation of Slippage

Although states are not required to meet their targets if fewer than 10 mediations occurred, Nevada has chosen for consistency to continue to explain slippage. There is a technical "slippage" from FFY2012 to FFY2013, but the very small "n" size in Nevada makes the year-to-year comparison between these two years invalid. Only two mediations were conducted during FFY2013, and only one mediation was conducted during FFY2012. Nevada resolved its due process hearing disputes during FFY2014 without a hearing in 98% of the cases, and the state mediation process but is one of many routes to resolution.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Not applicable.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	23.10%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	24.10%	25.10%	26.10%	27.10%	28.10%

Description of Measure

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015."

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015."

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015."

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015."

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015."

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015."

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015."

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name: Marva Clevon

Title: NV Special Education Director

Email: mclevon@doe.nv.gov

Phone: 775-687-9146