

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

Executive Summary:

In December 2005, the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) submitted its first State Performance Plan (SPP) to the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) describing baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for making improvements in key areas over the next six years. In the spring of 2015, the NDE submitted its first SPP/APR documentation using OSEP's new web-based reporting system. The state provided updated baseline data (as necessary), new targets for the FFY2013-2018 timeframe, actual FFY2013 data, and Phase I of its State Systemic Improvement Plan (Indicator 17). This SPP/APR provides actual FFY2014 data for 16 Performance Indicators designed to:

- (1) increase high-school graduation rates for students with disabilities earning regular diplomas;
- (2) decrease the dropout rate for students with disabilities;
- (3) ensure that all students participate in statewide assessments and improve the performance of students with disabilities in those assessments;
- (4) reduce suspension and expulsion rates when those rates significantly exceed statewide averages;
- (5) provide school-age students with disabilities ages 6-21 with services in the least restrictive environment;
- (6) provide preschool children with disabilities ages 3-5 with services in the least restrictive environment;
- (7) improve knowledge, skills, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes for preschool children with disabilities;
- (8) improve parents' involvement in their children's special education programs;
- (9) eliminate disproportionate identification of students in race/ethnic groups as having a disability when it is the result of inappropriate identification;
- (10) eliminate disproportionate identification of students in race/ethnic groups as having a particular disability when it is the result of inappropriate identification;
- (11) ensure compliance with the state law timeline to conduct initial evaluations for students with disabilities;
- (12) ensure a smooth transition from infant/toddler programs to school-based programs for preschool children with disabilities by ensuring that IEPs are developed and implemented by age 3;
- (13) improve transition planning for students with disabilities at the secondary school level by ensuring compliance with transition-related IEP components;
- (14) improve post-school outcomes for students with disabilities in the areas of post-secondary education/training and employment;
- (15) promote resolution sessions as a mechanism for resolving disputes; and
- (16) promote mediations as a mechanism for resolving disputes.

Progress for each of these Performance Indicators is reported in this February 2016 SPP/APR for the 2014-2015 school year (FFY2014).

On June 30, 2015, then Nevada Superintendent of Public Instruction Dale A.R. Erquiaga received correspondence from the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), advising that based on OSEP's review of Nevada's FFY2013 SPP/APR, Nevada had been determined to need assistance for two consecutive years.

Pursuant to the requirements under 34 CFR 300.604(a), Nevada was advised of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources. The state was directed to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The state was strongly encouraged to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which the state received a score of zero. Finally, the state was directed that it must report with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2016, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

The required information is attached in a document entitled "[SUMMARY OF NEVADA'S WORK WITH OSEP-FUNDED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTERS AND RESOURCES, February 1, 2016.](#)"

Attachments				
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove	
nde report of access to technical assistance.pdf	Ann Alexander		<input type="button" value="R"/>	e m o v e

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

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

In recent years, the NDE has 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 analyses 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, and 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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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 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, described above.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following 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 2015 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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 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 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Reporting LEA Performance

The progress 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.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation
Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			22.00%	80.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	77.14%
Data		23.30%	20.60%	16.30%	25.10%	23.40%	27.20%	23.50%	24.20%	26.43%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following 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.

Indicator 1: Graduation

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	933	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,385	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	27.56%	Calculate 

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
933	3,385	26.43%	83.76%	27.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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:

No difference exists between the conditions required of a youth with an IEP and a youth without 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:

of cohort members who earn a regular high school diploma

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 2013-14 IEP students:

IEP students earning regular diplomas in 2013-2014 = **933**

9th graders including students who transferred in during 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 through summer of 2014 = **4,241**

IEP students who transferred out, emigrated, or died during 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 through summer of 2014 = **856**

The calculation of the state's IEP adjusted cohort graduation rate for the 2013-2014 school year is:

$$\frac{(933)}{(4,241 - 856)} \times 100 = 27.56\%$$

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out
Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			7.40%	7.10%	6.80%	6.50%	6.20%	5.70%	5.60%	5.50%
Data		8.00%	8.70%	9.20%	5.60%	5.70%	5.00%	4.40%	4.00%	6.58%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following 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 FFY2018.

Indicator 2: Drop Out
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	745	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	438	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	45	null
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	1,151	null
SY 2013-14 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/4/2015	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	8	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
615	13,070	6.58%	5.40%	4.71%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

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

Dropout Rate Calculation:

As of the 2013-2014 school year, Nevada has revised its calculation for a high school dropout rate to conform to the adjusted cohort graduation rate logic used by many other states. As a result, the NDE no longer includes "nonreturns" as part of the calculation of the adjusted cohort graduation 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.

In a given year, the formula is expressed as:

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

Total IEP Enrollment

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 2013-2014 IEP students:

Total IEP Dropouts = **615**

Total IEP Enrollment = **13,070**

The calculation of the state's IEP dropout rate for the 2013-2014 school year is:

$$\frac{(615)}{(13,070)} \times 100 = 4.71\%$$

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

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

Historical Data and Targets

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

No longer required due to passage of ESSA.

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			85.70%	85.70%	88.90%	87.50%	87.50%	87.50%	87.50%	90.00%
Data		87.50%	100%	100%	37.50%	30.80%	87.50%	55.50%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

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.

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

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/13/2016	Number of districts in the State	18	null

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
18	null	null	0%	90.00%		Incomplete Data	n/a

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students

with IEPs

Reporting Group Selection

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

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

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

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	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%	93.70%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			95.00%	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%	93.67%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following 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.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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))

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 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	414	475	425	354	380	334	0	0	3021	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations									1648		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations									954		
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	407	468	416	348	374	330			270		

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/23/1015

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	414	475	425	354	380	334	0	0	3021	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations									734		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations									1885		
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	405	465	416	350	376	328			271		

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	5,403	5,215	93.70%	95.00%	96.52%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	5,403	5,230	93.67%	95.00%	96.80%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The calculated percentages, which appear above, of students with disabilities who participated in statewide assessments during FFY2014 are invalid at the time of Nevada’s February 2016 submission because the calculations are based on incomplete data. No participation data were included for students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 who participated in regular statewide assessments because those data were not submitted to ED*Facts* in December 2015. An explanation for this irregularity follows.

During FFY2014, Nevada’s CRTs for English and math were administered on computers for the first time. Approximately 213,515 students were expected to take the new Smarter Balanced assessments, but computer server problems with Nevada’s test vendor, Measured Progress, and the Smarter Balanced test platform prevented the majority of students in Nevada from completing all four sections of the assessment. The Smarter Balanced assessment was not administered in Nevada in the manner intended, causing the Department’s superintendent at the time to declare a statewide irregularity in test administration for these CRTs.

Statewide, approximately 30 percent of students in grades 3 through 8 were able to successfully complete at least one subject (either English or math) on the test. In December 2015, incomplete assessment (participation and performance) data were filed with the U.S. Department of Education via ED*Facts*. IDEA

assessment (participation and performance) data for students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 who participated in the regular statewide assessment were not submitted.

During January 2016, the NDE was directed by the U.S. Department of Education to resubmit its assessment data in order to include all available assessment results, even though those results will continue to be incomplete for grades 3 through 8 for the reasons described above. As directed, the NDE will resubmit all available assessment data by March 2, 2016. We anticipate that although additional data will be submitted, the submission will continue to be incomplete. When the resubmission is completed and the data are re-populated, the NDE will address the accuracy and completeness of its data submission during the OSEP clarification period.

Nevada is working with a new test vendor (Data Recognition Corporation) to ensure administration of the Smarter Balanced assessment will be timely, accurate, and complete in 2016.

UPDATE: As of the closing date of the April OSEP clarification period, Nevada's assessment participation and performance data for students with disabilities for FFY2014 continue to be incomplete, resulting in invalid calculated percentages for Indicators 3B and 3C. The NDE was unable to upload complete and valid assessment data for FFY2014 into the EDFacts system by the April 13, 2016, deadline because complete data do not exist, and the state continued to encounter errors in the EDFacts system when attempting to resubmit additional, incomplete data.

OSEP Response

The data for this indicator are not valid and reliable, and OSEP cannot determine whether the State met its targets. These data are not valid and reliable because, as reported by the State, "The calculated percentages, which appear above, of students with disabilities who participated in statewide assessments during FFY2014 are invalid at the time of Nevada's February 2016 submission because the calculations are based on incomplete data." The State further explained the steps it is taking to address the issue.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

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

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2014 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Grade 3	x											
B	Grade 4		x										
C	Grade 5			x									
D	Grade 6				x								
E	Grade 7					x							
F	Grade 8						x						
G	Grade 11									x			

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			26.50%	28.00%	29.50%	31.00%	32.50%	34.00%	35.50%	37.00%
			Data		25.70%	33.10%	30.90%	31.10%	33.30%	33.00%	31.40%	32.50%	32.34%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	34.00%
			Data		25.80%	28.60%	28.10%	30.40%	31.80%	30.60%	33.50%	31.60%	30.14%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			21.50%	23.00%	24.50%	26.00%	27.50%	29.00%	30.50%	32.00%
			Data		14.10%	21.70%	19.00%	21.40%	23.80%	25.00%	25.30%	26.00%	25.94%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			21.00%	22.00%	23.00%	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%
			Data		20.20%	19.90%	23.70%	22.60%	25.60%	18.30%	19.50%	20.90%	20.95%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			18.00%	19.00%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%	23.00%	24.00%	25.00%
			Data		17.30%	25.60%	24.20%	29.70%	30.70%	15.80%	16.00%	18.50%	19.09%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			19.50%	20.50%	21.50%	22.50%	23.50%	24.50%	25.50%	26.50%
			Data		16.00%	17.80%	19.20%	21.70%	25.70%	11.10%	13.90%	12.20%	13.19%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥			27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	34.00%
			Data		30.10%	36.70%	36.40%	61.50%	67.50%	69.30%	34.60%	34.00%	56.13%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%
			Data		30.50%	34.80%	36.90%	35.90%	42.60%	45.80%	45.80%	40.40%	36.01%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			32.00%	33.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%
			Data		30.80%	38.00%	40.20%	37.70%	39.80%	42.00%	44.10%	39.40%	36.39%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%
			Data		23.80%	28.20%	30.60%	31.50%	35.80%	37.20%	37.40%	33.40%	30.33%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%
			Data		23.00%	23.20%	27.00%	30.30%	28.30%	30.10%	35.30%	16.00%	17.82%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			18.00%	19.00%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%	23.00%	24.00%	25.00%
			Data		17.30%	21.70%	21.90%	26.40%	26.50%	30.70%	33.80%	17.00%	17.39%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			18.50%	20.00%	21.50%	23.00%	24.50%	26.00%	27.50%	29.00%
			Data		15.00%	17.40%	19.10%	19.30%	21.50%	20.70%	23.70%	11.10%	9.98%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥			15.50%	17.00%	18.50%	20.00%	21.50%	23.00%	24.50%	26.00%
			Data		11.60%	15.10%	16.10%	28.00%	32.10%	31.60%	34.80%	33.80%	93.26%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following stakeholder input:

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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))

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 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/23/2015

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	407	468	416	348	374	330	0	0	2872	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level									904		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level									515		
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	295	280	203	195	205	174			183		

Data Source: SY 2014-15 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 4/23/16

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	405	465	416	350	376	328	0	0	2890	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level									692		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level									1788		

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
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	139	191	221	182	205	172			239		

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3	407	295	32.34%	38.50%	72.48%	Met Target	No Slippage
B Grade 4	468	280	30.14%	35.00%	59.83%	Met Target	No Slippage
C Grade 5	416	203	25.94%	33.50%	48.80%	Met Target	No Slippage
D Grade 6	348	195	20.95%	29.00%	56.03%	Met Target	No Slippage
E Grade 7	374	205	19.09%	26.00%	54.81%	Met Target	No Slippage
F Grade 8	330	174	13.19%	27.50%	52.73%	Met Target	No Slippage
G Grade 11	2,872	1,602	56.13%	35.00%	55.78%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3	405	139	36.01%	49.00%	34.32%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B Grade 4	465	191	36.39%	40.00%	41.08%	Met Target	No Slippage
C Grade 5	416	221	30.33%	42.00%	53.13%	Met Target	No Slippage
D Grade 6	350	182	17.82%	33.00%	52.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
E Grade 7	376	205	17.39%	26.00%	54.52%	Met Target	No Slippage
F Grade 8	328	172	9.98%	30.50%	52.44%	Met Target	No Slippage
G Grade 11	2,890	2,719	93.26%	27.50%	94.08%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Group A Slippage

These percentages are invalid as calculations of the statewide proficiency rate. See section below entitled "Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)" for an explanation of irregularity in Nevada's FFY 2014 test administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments for students in grades 3 through 8.

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The calculated percentages, which appear above, of students with disabilities who were proficient on statewide assessments during FFY2014 are invalid at the time of Nevada's February 2016 submission because the calculations are based on incomplete data. No data have been prepopulated for students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 who participated in regular statewide assessments because those data were not submitted to ED*Facts* in December 2015. An explanation for this irregularity follows.

During FFY2014, Nevada's CRTs for English and math were administered on computers for the first time. Approximately 213,515 students were expected to take the new Smarter Balanced assessments, but computer server problems with Nevada's test vendor, Measured Progress, and the Smarter Balanced test platform prevented the majority of students in Nevada from completing all four sections of the assessment. The Smarter Balanced assessment was not administered in Nevada in the manner intended, causing the Department's superintendent at the time to declare a statewide irregularity in test administration for these CRTs.

Statewide, approximately 30 percent of students in grades 3 through 8 were able to successfully complete at least one subject (either English or math) on the test. In December 2015, incomplete assessment (participation and performance) data were filed with the U.S. Department of Education via ED*Facts*. IDEA assessment (participation and performance) data for students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 who participated in the regular statewide assessment were not submitted.

During January 2016, the NDE was directed by the U.S. Department of Education to resubmit its assessment data in order to include all available assessment results, even though those results will continue to be incomplete for grades 3 through 8 for the reasons described above. As directed, the NDE will resubmit all available assessment data by March 2, 2016. We anticipate that although additional data will be submitted, the submission will continue to be incomplete. When the resubmission is completed and the data are re-populated, the NDE will address the accuracy and completeness of its data submission during the OSEP clarification period.

Nevada is working with a new test vendor (Data Recognition Corporation) to ensure administration of the Smarter Balanced assessment will be timely, accurate, and complete in 2016.

UPDATE: As of the closing date of the April OSEP clarification period, Nevada's assessment participation and performance data for students with disabilities for FFY2014 continue to be incomplete, resulting in invalid calculated percentages for Indicators 3B and 3C. The NDE was unable to upload complete and valid assessment data for FFY2014 into the ED*Facts* system by the April 13, 2016, deadline because complete data do not exist, and the state continued to encounter errors in the ED*Facts* system when attempting to resubmit additional, incomplete data.

OSEP Response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator, and OSEP cannot determine whether the State met its targets for this indicator. The State explained that, "the calculated percentages of students with disabilities who were proficient on statewide assessments during FFY2014 are invalid at the time of Nevada's February 2016 submission because the calculations are based on incomplete data." The State further explained the steps it is taking to address the issue.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		5.90%	5.90%	5.90%	5.90%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following stakeholder input:

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

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/13/2016	Number of districts in the State	18	null

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	2	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

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))

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Not applicable. The state was not required to complete a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY2014 because 0% of districts had a significant discrepancy in FFY2013 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:

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/13/2016	Number of districts in the State	18	null

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	2	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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.

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

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))

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Not applicable. The state was not required to complete a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY2014 because 0% of districts had a significant discrepancy in FFY2013, 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).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 5: Education Environments

(children 6-21)

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	62.00%
		Data		63.80%	58.90%	60.70%	62.70%	63.40%	64.20%	64.30%	63.90%	64.26%
B	2005	Target ≤			15.60%	15.50%	15.40%	15.30%	15.20%	15.10%	15.00%	15.00%
		Data		15.60%	13.20%	13.00%	12.80%	13.40%	13.70%	13.90%	14.20%	14.21%
C	2005	Target ≤			1.70%	1.70%	1.70%	1.70%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%
		Data		2.00%	1.70%	1.70%	1.70%	1.90%	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%	1.47%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following 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.

Indicator 5: Education Environments

(children 6-21)

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	45,218	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	28,862	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,536	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	538	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	1	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	134	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	28,862	45,218	64.26%	62.00%	63.83%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,536	45,218	14.21%	15.00%	14.45%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	673	45,218	1.47%	1.60%	1.49%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									23.70%	23.70%
		Data									23.50%	21.80%
B	2011	Target ≤									54.30%	54.30%
		Data									54.60%	59.10%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following 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.

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,537	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	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	2,308	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,714	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	77	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,308	8,537	22.45%	23.70%	27.04%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,791	8,537	61.67%	54.30%	56.12%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2013	Target ≥						73.40%	74.40%	75.40%	76.40%	76.40%
		Data					73.40%	79.50%	80.60%	76.70%	81.10%	78.55%
A2	2013	Target ≥						73.70%	74.70%	75.70%	76.70%	57.13%
		Data					73.70%	76.20%	70.70%	60.60%	57.80%	57.13%
B1	2013	Target ≥						72.10%	73.10%	74.10%	75.10%	75.10%
		Data					72.10%	74.10%	85.40%	78.80%	78.90%	77.06%
B2	2013	Target ≥						65.80%	66.80%	67.80%	68.80%	54.14%
		Data					65.80%	54.20%	60.80%	55.80%	52.90%	54.14%
C1	2013	Target ≥						75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	78.00%
		Data					75.00%	78.40%	86.80%	75.60%	73.10%	72.21%
C2	2013	Target ≥						76.80%	77.80%	78.80%	79.80%	60.32%
		Data					76.80%	77.10%	82.20%	66.30%	61.90%	60.32%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following 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 were 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.

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data	
Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	3300.00

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	204.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	488.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	793.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1180.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	635.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1973.00	2665.00	78.55%	76.40%	74.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1815.00	3300.00	57.13%	57.13%	55.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of A1 Slippage

Within the evaluation for positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships), there were 204 total (6.18%) children identified as preschool children who did not improve functioning. The NDE suspects that this number is too high as the result of the need for more training. Through anecdotal comments during training events it appears that there continues to be a misunderstanding as to what constitutes improvement in functioning [for the yes/no progress question]. A significant number of providers continue to have the misunderstanding that the progress needs to be adequate to move the COM score to a higher number rather than reflecting if ANY progress has been made. This issue is being targeted in current and future professional development.

During the process of data analysis, it was also discovered that data were missing for children identified as speech language impaired. Children with this disability would most likely score higher for this outcome and it is likely that those missing scores caused the scores to be lower than previous years. This issue is being targeted in our Child Outcomes Data Quality Intensive TA with on one of the goals of the TA being to increase the capacity of state teams to examine, discuss, and improve the quality of their child outcomes data.

Explanation of A2 Slippage

See Explanation of A1 Slippage. Slippage in A2 is explained by the same considerations.

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	206.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	487.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	827.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1272.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	508.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2099.00	2792.00	77.06%	75.10%	75.18%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1780.00	3300.00	54.14%	54.14%	53.94%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	338.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	383.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	608.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1176.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	795.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	1784.00	2505.00	72.21%	78.00%	71.22%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	1971.00	3300.00	60.32%	60.32%	59.73%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Historical Data and Targets

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?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	78.00%
Data		71.20%	68.20%	71.70%	74.00%	76.00%	74.00%	76.00%	74.00%	75.98%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following stakeholder input:

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

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
1075.00	1515.00	75.98%	78.00%	70.96%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Explanation of Slippage

During 2014-2015, 71% of Nevada parents responded in agreement to survey question #25, down slightly from 76% during 2013-2014. Nevada did not reach its target of 78% for this indicator. Because parents in different school districts are surveyed each year (except for Clark and Washoe, whose parents are surveyed every year), slight progress or slippage from one year to the next is not considered significant. During the last several years, the percentage of Nevada parents agreeing with survey question #25 has remained stable in the low- to mid-70% range.

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 FFY2014, parent surveys were disseminated to all students with disabilities in five districts scheduled for a comprehensive monitoring visit (Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander). In addition, a sample was selected for parent survey in Clark County School District and Washoe County School District because these districts have an average daily membership (ADM) of more than 50,000 students.

Surveys were successfully sent to 9,798 parents, and a total of 1,569 responses were received for a 16.0% response rate ($1,569/9,798 = 16.0\%$), up slightly from the FFY2013 rate of 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 FFY2014 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, 2014, 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:

- 4% students with intellectual disabilities in child count, compared to 5% in child survey
- 14% students with speech/language impairment in child count, compared to 16% 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 11% in survey
- 11% students with developmental delay in child count, compared to 10% in survey
- 11.4% students with autism in child count, compared to 14% in survey

Approximately 38% of the responding parents were parents of children with learning disabilities, compared to 43.2% in the child count. This represents a 5.2-point gap, which has been reduced considerably from the 10-point gap in FFY2012, and the 7.8-point gap in FFY2013.

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, but in every category, the gap was smaller than in the previous two years.

- 41% students in Hispanic category in child count, compared to 37% in survey (4 point gap) (6.5 point gap in FFY2013) (6.3 point gap in FFY2012)
- 15% students in Black/African American category in child count, compared to 8% in survey (7 point gap) (7.9 point gap in FFY2013) (8.7 point gap in FFY2012)
- 34% students in White category in child count, compared to 45% in survey (9 point gap) (11.7 point gap in FFY2013) (13 point gap in FFY2012)

Significant improvement occurred through reducing the gaps for students in the Hispanic, 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 (10%) and in the survey (12%) 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 represents (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 a 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/13/2016	Number of districts in the State	18	null

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	16	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories
FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
Part B Introduction Page	1/13/2016	Number of districts in the State	18	null

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	3	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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, 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 FFY2014

During FFY2014, 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: 5 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 12 or fewer students)
- Other Health Impairment: 8 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 18 or fewer students)
- Intellectual Disabilities: 8 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 4 or fewer students)
- Specific Learning Disabilities: 5 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 24 or fewer students)
- Speech or Language Impairments: 5 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 15 or fewer students)
- Autism: 9 LEAs were excluded (all with cell sizes containing 21 or fewer students)

The total "unduplicated" number of LEAs that were excluded from the calculation was 15.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 11: Child Find

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		76.40%	83.00%	95.60%	87.20%	100%	100%	100%	94.40%	96.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Indicator 11: Child Find

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
20	19	96.30%	100%	95.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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

Explanation of Slippage

During 2014-2015, 95% of children with parental consent to evaluate were evaluated within 45 school days. Nevada did not reach its target for this indicator and there was very slight slippage from the previous year when the compliance calculation was 96.3%. Note, however, that because the calculation for this indicator 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. Very high levels of compliance for this indicator during the last several years may be attributed to increased focus and training regarding this indicator throughout the state.

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 fewer than 15 calendar days beyond the 45-school-day timeline due to staff scheduling conflicts.

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 State's timeline for initial evaluations?

Initial evaluations must be completed within 45 school days of the date that parents provide consent for the evaluation. (Nevada Administrative Code, 388.337)

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 11: Child Find

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

During FFY2013, four districts (Churchill, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Washoe) 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 Washoe 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, Washoe County School District submitted data from FFY2014 verifying that students initially referred for evaluations received timely evaluations, with no noncompliance.

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

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

The one student in Washoe County School District whose initial evaluation exceeded 45 school days was evaluated and the eligibility determination was made within 15 calendar days beyond the 45-school-day timeline. Consequently, within the 2013-2014 school year, the noncompliance for this student was already corrected and the student was receiving services in accordance with the student's IEP.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		83.90%	81.00%	73.90%	100%	99.20%	98.00%	100%	99.30%	98.58%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	25
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	0
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	22
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.	1
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	2

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	22	22	98.58%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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	0
--	---

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

During FFY2013, four districts (Churchill, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Washoe) 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 Washoe 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, Washoe County School District submitted data from FFY2014 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, with no noncompliance.

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

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

For the eight students in Washoe County School District whose IEPs were 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 2013-2014 school year, the noncompliance for these eight children was already corrected and the children were receiving services in accordance with their IEPs.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						92.90%	100%	91.67%	100%	91.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
8	8	91.30%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

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 selected record for students ages 16 and older is monitored to determine whether each of the required secondary transition components is in place.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

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 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

During FFY2013, four districts (Churchill, Esmeralda, Lincoln, Washoe) were selected for a comprehensive record review as part of Nevada's four-year monitoring cycle. A noncompliance finding for failure to include appropriate agency representative(s) as IEP participants was issued for Washoe 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, Washoe County School District provided evidence of IEPs completed for students aged 16+ during FFY2014, with no noncompliance.

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

Verification that each District has Corrected Each Individual Case of Noncompliance

In FFY2014, Washoe County School District provided evidence that the IEPs for the two students identified with noncompliance had been corrected to include evidence that IEP participants included appropriate agency representative(s).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2013

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2013 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	27.00%
		Data						24.00%	20.00%	18.00%	24.00%	21.39%
B	2009	Target ≥							54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	56.00%
		Data						53.00%	44.00%	50.00%	54.00%	56.05%
C	2009	Target ≥							70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	72.00%
		Data						69.00%	62.00%	67.00%	66.00%	69.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following 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.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

FFY 2014 Data

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))

FFY 2014 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	1085.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	234.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	375.00
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)	79.00
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).	67.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	234.00	1085.00	21.39%	27.00%	21.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	609.00	1085.00	56.05%	56.00%	56.13%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	755.00	1085.00	69.77%	72.00%	69.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Survey Response Rates

During FFY2014, surveys of students with disabilities who exited secondary school during 2013-2014 were provided to 2,791 students. Data were collected from 1,085 respondents, for a response rate of 38.9% (1,085 ÷ 2,791 = 38.9%). This response rate is comparable to the FFY2013 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
- 6.8% of the students surveyed had emotional disturbance; 5.4% of the respondents had emotional disturbance
- 5% of the students surveyed had intellectual disabilities; 4% of the respondents had intellectual disabilities

In FFY2014, differences between the survey group and the respondent group for these disability categories 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) status, with the following results.

- 62% of the students surveyed were minority students (non-White); 55% of the respondents were minority students (a 7-point difference).

This difference is comparable to FFY2013, and the state continues to address this issue with the survey vendor.

Gender and ELL Category

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

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

Each of these differences was within the +/- 3% acceptable range identified by NPSO. These results are comparable to the FFY2013 results.

Dropouts

Students were also compared for representativeness according to dropout status, with the following results.

- 19% of the students surveyed were dropouts; 9% of the respondents were dropouts (a 10-point difference).

This result is comparable to the FFY2013 result, and the state continues to address this issue with the survey vendor.

Summary

Representativeness is stable and within acceptable ranges for all groups except in the minority (non-White) and dropout categories. The NDE will continue to work with the vendor to specifically analyze the FFY2014 data in order to strengthen strategies to increase the response rates from students in the minority and dropout categories.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			85.00%	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%	65.17%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following stakeholder input:

Stakeholders supported continuing the targets at 85%.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

FFY 2014 Data

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)))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	65	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	81	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
65	81	65.17%	85.00%	80.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

Historical Data and Targets

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	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			80.00%	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%	50.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state obtained the following stakeholder input:

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

Indicator 16: Mediation

FFY 2014 Data

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))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	1	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	3	null

FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
2	1	3	50.00%	80.00%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 16: Mediation

Required Actions from FFY 2013

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))

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Plan Data and Overview

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.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		24.10%
Data	23.10%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP Phase II April 2016" where Nevada explains that it does not have FFY 2014 updated data from statewide assessments, due to a testing irregularity created by computer failure in the first year of SBAC administration.

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	25.10%	26.10%	27.10%	28.10%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Description of Measure

See "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Overview

See "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

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.

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 "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

Plan

Data and Overview

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.

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 "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

Plan

Data and Overview

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.

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

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 "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Description

See "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

Plan

Data and Overview

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.

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 "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement

Plan

Data and Overview

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.

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 "Nevada Part B SSIP April 2015" in the Nevada State Profile. No changes have been made as of April 2016.

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

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.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP Phase II April 2016."

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP Phase II April 2016."

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See attached "Nevada Part B SSIP Phase II April 2016."

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Nevada continues to require the Technical Assistance and Support provided by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the Language and Literacy Cross-State Learning Collaborative of NCSI, and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), for the kinds of technical assistance and support that is described in pages 3-5 of the Nevada Part B SSIP Phase II April 2016 report, attached.

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 Cleven

Title: Special Education Director

Email: mcleven@doe.nv.gov

Phone: 775-687-9146