



Texas Continuous Improvement Process

Annual Performance Report | FFY 2008

July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009

METHODOLOGY

This document contains the measurements for the State Performance Plan (SPP)/ Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicators. These measurements are reported at the state level in the APR submission, and at the district level in the public reporting process.

Texas Education Agency
Division of IDEA Coordination
<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/spp/>
Submitted: February 1, 2010

Table of Contents

Monitoring Priority | FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1	Graduation <i>Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.....</i>	1
Indicator 2	Dropout <i>Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.....</i>	2
Indicator 3	Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) <i>Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments</i> <i>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</i> <i>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</i> <i>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards.</i>	3
Indicator 4	Suspension and Expulsion <i>Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year</i>	6
Indicator 5	Educational Environment, Ages 6 - 21 <i>Percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21</i> <i>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</i> <i>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and</i> <i>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</i>	7
Indicator 9	Disproportionality <i>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification</i>	10
Indicator 10	Disproportionality <i>Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.....</i>	11

Monitoring Priority | Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11 Child Find

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).....12

Monitoring Priority | Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition

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 birthdays13

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 1

SPP Indicator # 1

Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth.

The graduation rate is calculated as follows:

number of students from a given cohort
who received a high school diploma

divided by

total number of students in a given cohort
(graduation + GED* + continuing + dropout)

*GED = General Educational Development (GED) certificates

Example:

Class of 2007 (2006-07)	
a. Number who graduated	70
b. Number who dropped out	10
c. Number who received GED	10
d. Number who continued	10
e. Number in cohort (class of 2007)	100

$$\text{Graduation rate} = (a. / e.) * 100$$

$$\text{Graduation rate} = (70 / 100) * 100$$

$$\text{Graduation rate} = 70\%$$

Data Source: Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), Class of 2008 (2007-08)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 2

SPP Indicator # 2

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth.

The dropout rate is calculated as follows:

number of students from a given cohort
who dropped out before the fall of a given year

divided by

total number of students in a given cohort
(graduation + GED* + continuing + dropout)

*GED = General Educational Development (GED) certificates

Example:

Class of 2007 (2006-07)	
a. Number who graduated	70
b. Number who dropped out	10
c. Number who received GED	10
d. Number who continued	10
e. Number in cohort (class of 2007)	100

$$\text{Dropout rate} = (b. / e.) * 100$$

$$\text{Dropout rate} = (10 / 100) * 100$$

$$\text{Dropout rate} = 10\%$$

Data Source: Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), Class of 2008 (2007-08)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 3A

SPP Indicator # 3A

Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.

Measurement:

Districts with the minimum "n" size must meet all four criteria listed below to meet the standard.

State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup ("n" size = 50):

1. 95% of students with disabilities participated in assessment in Reading/ELA
2. 95% of students with disabilities participated in assessment in Mathematics
3. 73% of students with disabilities meet the proficiency standard in Reading/ELA
4. 67% of students with disabilities meet the proficiency standard in Mathematics

Example:

AYP Objective	%	Met Objective
1. Students with disabilities who participated in assessment in Reading/ELA	98%	YES
2. Students with disabilities who participated in assessment in Mathematics	98%	YES
3. Students with disabilities who met the proficiency standard in Reading/ELA	76%	YES
4. Students with disabilities who met the proficiency standard in Mathematics	69%	YES

District met AYP objective?	YES
-----------------------------	-----

Data Source: 2008-09 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Datasets

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 3B

SPP Indicator # 3B

Participation rate for children with IEPs.

Measurement:

Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100);
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against modified achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100); and
- f. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(f) divided by (a)] times 100).

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)].

Example:

a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed	250	
b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	190	76%
c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	30	12%
d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards	0	0%
e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against modified achievement standards	15	6%
f. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	10	4%
Participants, Grades 3-8, 10	245	98%
Non-participants	5	2%

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)] * 100

Overall Percent = [(190 + 30 + 0 + 15 + 10) divided by (250)] * 100

Overall Percent = [(245) / (250)] * 100

Overall Percent = 98%

Data Source: 2008-09 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Datasets

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 3C

SPP Indicator # 3C

Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards

Measurement:

Proficiency rate =

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

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)].

Example:

a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed	250	
b. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations	133	53%
c. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations	37	15%
d. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards	0	0%
e. # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against modified achievement standards	12	5%
f. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards	8	3%
Total Proficient	190	76%

Overall Percent = [(b + c + d + e + f) divided by (a)] * 100

Overall Percent = [(133 + 37 + 0 + 12 + 8) divided by (250)] * 100

Overall Percent = [(190) / (250)] * 100

Overall Percent = 76%

Data Source: 2008-09 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Datasets

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 4

SPP Indicator # 4

Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year

Methodology

Methodology is available on the TEA website at:
<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/guidance/discipline/method.pdf>

Public Reporting

Actual data are not reported for Indicator 4. Instead, districts that exceed the cut point are reported as not having met the state target.

These districts must conduct a self assessment concerning policies, procedures, and practices for disciplining students with disabilities. After conducting the self assessment, districts are required to submit a written assurance statement to the TEA reflecting the district's compliance with rules and regulations.

Data Source: 2008-09 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 5A

SPP Indicator # 5A

Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Example:

Educational Environments, Students ages 6-21	#	%
a. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	80	53%
b. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	20	13%
c. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	10	7%
d. Inside the regular class no more than 79% of day but no less than 40% of day	40	27%
e. Total Students, Ages 6-21	150	100%

Percent inside the regular class 80%
or more of the day = [(a. divided by e.] * 100

Percent = [(80) / (150)] * 100

Percent = 53%

Data Source: 2008-09 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 5B

SPP Indicator # 5B

Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Example:

Educational Environments, Students ages 6-21	#	%
a. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	80	53%
b. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	20	13%
c. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	10	7%
d. Inside the regular class no more than 79% of day but no less than 40% of day	40	27%
e. Total Students, Ages 6-21	150	100%

Percent inside the regular class
less than 40% of the day = [(b. divided by e.) * 100

Percent = [(20) / (150)] * 100

Percent = 13%

Data Source: 2008-09 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 5C

SPP Indicator # 5C

Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Example:

Educational Environments, Students ages 6-21	#	%
a. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	80	53%
b. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	20	13%
c. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	10	7%
d. Inside the regular class no more than 79% of day but no less than 40% of day	40	27%
e. Total Students, Ages 6-21	150	100%

Percent in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. = [(c. divided by e.) * 100

Percent = [(10) / (150)] * 100

Percent = 7%

Data Source: 2008-09 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 9

SPP Indicator # 9

Disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups (African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, White) in the special education program.

The following methodology is used for African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, and White student populations, ages 6-21, from the 2008-09 PEIMS fall Snapshot.

Methodology

Methodology is available on the TEA website at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/guidance/disprop/2009method.pdf>

Public Reporting

Actual data are not reported for Indicator 9. Instead, districts that exceed the cut point are identified as having as a potential issue with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

These districts must conduct a self assessment concerning policies, procedures, and practices for the identification of students with disabilities. After conducting the self assessment, districts are required to submit a written assurance statement to the TEA reflecting the district's compliance with rules and regulations.

Districts that are unable to submit a written assurance statement are reported as not meeting the state target in their public report.

Data Source: 2008-09 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 10

SPP Indicator # 10

Disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups (African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, White) by specific disability categories.

The following methodology is used for African American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, and White student populations, ages 6-21, from the 2008-09 PEIMS fall Snapshot. The specific disability categories required for the analysis are Autism (AU), Emotional Disturbance (ED), Learning Disability (LD), Mental Retardation (MR), Other Health Impaired (OHI), and Speech Impairment (SI)..

Methodology

Methodology is available on the TEA website at:

<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/guidance/disprop/2009method.pdf>

Public Reporting

Actual data are not reported for Indicator 10. Instead, districts that exceed the cut point are identified as having as a potential issue with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

These districts must conduct a self assessment concerning policies, procedures, and practices for the identification of students with disabilities. After conducting the self assessment, districts are required to submit a written assurance statement to the TEA reflecting the district's compliance with rules and regulations.

Districts that are unable to submit a written assurance statement are reported as not meeting the state target in their public report.

Data Source: 2008-09 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 11

SPP Indicator # 11

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

Example:

Percentage of Timely Initial Evaluation	#
a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	100
b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 90 days (State established timeline)	8
c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 90 days (State established timeline)	88

Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline)	96%
---	-----

$$\text{Percent} = ((b. + c.) / a) * 100$$

$$\text{Percent} = [(8 + 88) / 100] * 100$$

$$\text{Percent} = 96\%$$

Public Reporting

Actual data are not reported for Indicator 11. Districts reporting less than 100% are reported as not meeting the state target in their public report.

Data Source: 2008-09 SPP11 Dataset

State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 12

SPP Indicator # 12

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

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

Percent = c divided by (a – b – d) times 100.

Example:

Percentage of Effective Part C to Part B Transition	#
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination	25
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays	2
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	19
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.	0

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.	83%
---	-----

Calculation = c divided by (a – b – d) * 100

Percent = 19 / (25 – 2 - 0) * 100

Percent = 19 / 23 * 100

Percent = 83%

Public Reporting

Actual data are not reported for Indicator 12. Districts reporting less than 100% are reported as not meeting the state target in their public report.

Data Source: 2008-09 SPP12 Dataset