

# DRAFT

**Montana CSPD Regions  
and the  
Regional Service Areas  
IDEA-Part B  
State Performance Indicator Report**

**For the 2008-2009 School Year**



[opi.mt.gov](http://opi.mt.gov)

Office of Public Instruction  
Denise Juneau, Superintendent  
PO Box 202501  
Helena, MT 59620-2501

**May 2010**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b> .....	5
CSPD Regional Performance .....	5
<b>ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE</b> .....	6
<b>Correlate 1: Curriculum</b> .....	6
<b>Indicator 5 – Education Environment</b> .....	6
Overview.....	6
Indicator 5A – Served in the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day .....	6
Target Data Analysis .....	6
Trend Data Analysis .....	7
Needs Assessment .....	8
Indicator 5B – Removed from Regular Class > 60% of the Day .....	8
Target Data Analysis .....	8
Trend Data Analysis .....	9
Needs Assessment .....	10
Indicator 5C – Served in Separate Facilities .....	10
Target Data Analysis .....	10
Trend Data Analysis .....	11
Needs Assessment .....	11
Improvement Strategies .....	12
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	12
<b>Correlate 2: Assessment</b> .....	13
<b>Indicator 3 – State Assessments</b> .....	13
Overview.....	13
Indicator 3A – AYP Objectives.....	13
Target Data Analysis .....	14
Trend Data Analysis .....	14
Indicator 3B – Participation Rates.....	15
Target Data Analysis .....	16
Trend Data Analysis .....	17
Indicator 3C – Proficiency Rates.....	18
Target Data Analysis .....	19
Trend Data Analysis .....	20
Needs Assessment .....	21
Improvement Strategies .....	22
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	23
<b>Correlate 3: Instruction</b> .....	23
<b>Indicator 1 – Graduation Rates</b> .....	23
Overview.....	23
Target Data Analysis .....	24
Trend Data Analysis .....	24
Needs Assessment .....	24
Improvement Strategies .....	25
Performance Target (2008-2009 School Year).....	26
<b>Indicator 2 – Dropout Rates</b> .....	26
Overview.....	26
Target Data Analysis .....	26
Trend Data Analysis .....	27

Needs Assessment .....	27
Improvement Strategies .....	27
Performance Target (2008-2009 School Year).....	28
<b>LEARNING ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Correlate 4: School Culture .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Indicator 4A – Suspension and Expulsion Rates .....</b>	<b>28</b>
Overview.....	28
Target Data Analysis .....	29
Trend Data Analysis .....	30
Needs Assessment .....	31
Improvement Strategies .....	31
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	31
<b>Correlate 5: Student, Family, and Community Support .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Indicator 8 – Parent Involvement.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Overview.....	32
Target Data Analysis .....	32
Trend Data Analysis .....	33
Needs Assessment .....	34
Improvement Strategies .....	34
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	35
<b>Indicator 11 – Child Find .....</b>	<b>35</b>
Overview.....	35
Target Data Analysis .....	35
Trend Data Analysis .....	36
Needs Assessment .....	36
Improvement Strategies .....	37
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	37
<b>Indicator 12 – Part C to Part B Transition.....</b>	<b>37</b>
Overview.....	37
Target Data Analysis .....	38
Trend Data Analysis .....	39
Needs Assessment .....	39
Improvement Strategies .....	40
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	40
<b>EFFICIENCY.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Correlate 7: Leadership.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Indicator 9 – Disproportionate Representation .....</b>	<b>40</b>
Overview.....	40
Target Data Analysis .....	41
Needs Assessment .....	42
Improvement Strategies .....	42
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	42
<b>Indicator 10 – Disproportionate Representation - Disability Categories .....</b>	<b>43</b>
Overview.....	43
Target Data Analysis .....	43
Needs Assessment .....	44
Improvement Strategies .....	44
Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year).....	44
<b>APPENDIX A .....</b>	<b>45</b>
CSPD REGION I-PESA.....	45

CSPD REGION II-MNCESR.....	46
CSPD REGION III-SMART .....	48
CSPD REGION IV-RESA4U.....	50
CSPD REGION V-WM-CSPD .....	52
<b>APPENDIX B</b> .....	55
Compliance Monitoring List.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a regional perspective of school district performance on IDEA-Part B state performance indicators and targets as outlined in Montana's State Performance Plan.

The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004* requires states to submit a State Performance Plan (Part B – SPP) outlining efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of Part B of the Act, and describes how the state will improve such implementation [20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(1)].

The primary focus of the Performance Plan is based on *three key monitoring priorities* for the Office of Special Education Programs of the U.S. Department of Education:

1. Provision of a **free appropriate public education** (FAPE) **in the least restrictive environment** (LRE);
2. the State exercise of **general supervisory authority**; and
3. **disproportionate representation** of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Within each of the three monitoring priorities, performance indicators established by the United States Secretary of Education quantify and prioritize outcome indicators for special education. Montana has established measurable and rigorous targets for these 20 performance indicators with which to assess performance of both local educational agencies and the state over the next six years.

To ensure statistically sound data when evaluating progress in meeting the established performance target, a minimum (N) and/or confidence intervals are applied to reduce the effect of small sample sizes. For further information as to the formulas, statistical methods and/or definitions used for each of the Performance Indicators, please refer to Montana's State Performance Plan at <http://www.opi.mt.gov/SpecEd/index.html>.

## CSPD Regional Performance

The purpose of this report is to provide an evaluation of performance of each CSPD region based on the state's established performance targets. The report includes performance indicators the state is required to publicly report. District performance reports can be accessed using the following link [http://www.opi.mt.gov/Reports&Data/Index.html#gpm1\\_11](http://www.opi.mt.gov/Reports&Data/Index.html#gpm1_11).

Beginning with this report, there is a change in the format used to present the Performance Indicator data. To facilitate a more collaborative model of professional development, we will report Region performance on the Indicators grouped under the Montana Correlate of Effective Schools categories of Academic Performance, Learning Environment, and Efficiency. In addition, we will include the appropriate Regional Service Area (RSA) aligned with the CSPD Region.

Although the format for reporting includes data for all regions, it is recommended that **comparisons between CSPD/RSA regions should not be made** due to the variability in the characteristics of students between regions. Each CSPD region is unique in its number of districts and the students they serve. **Regional demographics for each CSPD/RSA region are provided in the appendix of this document.**

# ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

## MONTANA CORRELATE 1: Curriculum

The school develops and implements a curriculum that is rigorous, intentional, and aligned to state standards.

## State Performance Indicator 5 – Education Environment

### Overview

Montana Correlate #1 asserts an effective school will develop and implement a rigorous curriculum aligned with state standards. The State Performance Indicator #5 evaluates the extent to which students with disabilities are given access to this curriculum by looking at the percentage of time students receive special education services within the regular classroom.

The education environment count of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, is part of the larger child count data collection that is conducted the first Monday in October each year. The IDEA Part B State Performance Plan requires that we report annually on the percent of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, for the following education environment categories:

- **Regular Class:** Served in the regular class 80 percent or more of the day.
- **Full-time Special Education:** Served in regular class less than 40 percent of the day.
- **Served in Separate Facilities:** A roll-up of public/private separate schools, residential placements, and home or hospital settings.

The education environment rate is calculated by dividing the number of students, ages 6-21, in a particular education environment by the number of students with disabilities, ages 6-21, enrolled in the district.

### Indicator 5A – Served in the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day

#### Target Data Analysis

Table 5.1 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the state’s established performance targets for Indicator 5A, the percent of students with disabilities served in the regular class 80 percent or more of the day. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 5.1 Performance on Indicator 5A for the State and CSPD/RSA Regions**

	Special Education Setting Count	Students with Disabilities Total Count	Education Environment Rate	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
<b>State of Montana</b>	<b>15691</b>	<b>8186</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>49.0%</b>	<b>Met Target</b>
CSPD Region I - PESA	1738	916	52.7%	55.9%	49.5%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	2412	1316	54.6%	57.2%	51.9%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	3403	1539	45.2%	47.7%	42.8%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	3461	1991	57.5%	59.7%	55.3%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	4541	2409	53.0%	55.0%	51.1%		Met Target

Analysis of the target data indicates the following:


- ❖ State and CSPD/RSA Region data indicate over 50% of students with disabilities are served in the regular class 80 percent or more of the day.

- ❖ The state and four of the five CSPD/RSA regions have met the established performance target of **49 percent** of students with disabilities are served in the regular class for 80 percent or more of the day, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- ❖ The percent of students with disabilities served in the regular class 80 percent or more of the day within the CSPD/RSA regions range from a *low* of **45.2 percent** to a *high* of **57.5 percent**.
- ❖ CSPD Region III-SMART has an education environment rate of **45.2 percent**, which is *lower* than the performance target for this indicator.
- ❖ Four of the CSPD/RSA regions have education environment rates *greater than* the state's education environment rate of 52.2 percent.

### Trend Data Analysis

Figure 5.1 below provides trend data for the percent of students with disabilities who are removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day.

**Figure 5. 1 Performance Indicator 5A Trend Data for State and CSPD/RSA Regions**



Analysis of the trend data indicates the following:

- ❖ The state and three of the CSPD/RSA regions show an increase in the percent of students served in the regular class for 80 percent or more of the day.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA had the greatest increase of **4.9 percent** over last year, while CSPD Region II-MNCESR came in second with an increase of **4.5 percent** of students with disabilities served in the regular class for 80 percent or more of the day.
- ❖ CSPD Region III-SMART has the largest decrease of **1.4 percent** in the rate of students with disabilities served in the regular class for 80 percent or more of the day for this year.

## Needs Assessment

Even if a CSPD/RSA region met the state performance target, you can use the following set of questions to determine if there is a need to provide professional development related to serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that will have an impact on where students with disabilities receive services in your region to ensure students are receiving special education and related services in the least restrictive environment.

- ✓ Compare the Indicator 5A education environment rate for your CSPD/RSA Region to the Indicator 5A education environment rate for the state.
  - Is the region's education environment rate lower than the state's rate?
- ✓ Compare the Indicator 5A education environment rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the education environment rate lower than the state's established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
  - Is the education environment rate lower than the state's established performance target for the 2009-2010 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the education environment rate for your region decreased over the past year?

## **Indicator 5B – Removed from Regular Class > 60% of the Day**

### Target Data Analysis

Table 5.2 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established performance target for Indicator 5B, the percent of students with disabilities served in the regular class for less than 40 percent of the day. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 5.2 State and CSPD/RSA Region Performance Status for Indicator 5B**

	Special Education Setting Count	Students with Disabilities Total Count	Education Environment Rate	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	15691	1829	11.7%	12.2%	11.2%	12.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	1738	227	13.1%	18.1%	9.3%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	2412	274	11.4%	15.7%	8.1%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	3403	530	15.6%	18.9%	12.7%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	3461	341	9.9%	13.5%	7.1%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	4541	455	10.0%	13.1%	7.6%		Met Target


Analysis of the target data for Indicator 5B shows the following:

- ❖ The state and the five CSPD/RSA regions have met the established performance target of **12 percent** of students with disabilities are served in the regular class for less than 40 percent of the day.
- ❖ CSPD Region II-MNCESR, Region IV-RESA4U, and Region V-WM-CSPD show an education environment rate *lower* than the state's education environment rate for this indicator.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA and Region III-SMART have education environment rates that are *higher* than the state's education environment rate for this indicator.

### Trend Data Analysis

Figure 5.2 below provides trend data for the percent of students with disabilities that are removed from regular class for greater than 60 percent of the day. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Figure 5. 2 Performance Indicator 5B Trend Data for the State and CSPD/RSA Regions**



Analysis of the trend data indicates the following:

- ❖ CSPD Region II-MNCESR, Region III-SMART, and Region V-WM-CSPD show a *decrease* in the percent of students with disabilities served in the regular class for less than 40 percent of the day for the current year.
- ❖ The state's education environment rates for this indicator remained the same as last year.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA shows the largest *increase* of **1.4 percent** in the percent of students with disabilities served in the regular class for less than 40 percent of the day for the current year.

## Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance targets for the 2008-2009 school year, there still may be a need to provide professional development related to serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that will have an impact on where students with disabilities receive services in your region.

- ✓ Compare the Indicator 5B education environment rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the Indicator 5B education environment rate for the state.
  - Is the region's education environment rate higher than the state's rate?
- ✓ Compare the Indicator 5B education environment rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the education environment rate higher than the state's established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
  - Is the education environment rate higher than the state's established performance target for the 2009-2010 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the education environment rate for your region increasing each year?

## Indicator 5C – Served in Separate Facilities

### Target Data Analysis

Table 5.3 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established performance target for Indicator 5C, the percent of students with disabilities served in separate facilities. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 5.3 State and CSPD/RSA Region Performance Status for Indicator 5C**

	Special Education Setting Count	Students with Disabilities Total Count	Education Environment Rate	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	15691	243	1.5%	1.8%	1.4%	1.5%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	1738	12	0.7%	25.3%	0.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	2412	13	0.5%	23.6%	0.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	3403	50	1.5%	9.7%	0.2%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	3461	40	1.2%	10.8%	0.1%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	4541	28	0.6%	13.1%	0.0%		Met Target

Analysis of the target data indicates the following:


- ❖ The state and all five CSPD/RSA Regions have met the established performance target of **1.5 percent** of students with disabilities served in separate facilities.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA, CSPD Region II-MNCESR, Region IV-RESA4U, and Region V-WM-CSPD have education environment rates **lower** than the state's education environment rate and the established performance target for this indicator.

- ❖ CSPD Region III-SMART has an education environment rate that is **comparable** to the state's education environment rate and the established performance target for this indicator.

### Trend Data Analysis

Figure 5.3 below provides trend data on the percent of students with disabilities served in separate facilities.

**Figure 5.3 Performance Indicator 5C Trend Data for the State and CSPD/RSA Regions**



Analysis of the trend data indicates the following:

- ❖ CSPD Region IV-RESA4U and Region V-WM-CSPD show a slight **decrease** in the percent of students with disabilities being served in separate facilities.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCESR, Region III-SMART and the state show slight **increases** in the percent of students with disabilities being served in separate facilities.

### Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance targets for the 2008-2009 school year, there still may be a need to provide professional development related to serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that will have an impact on where students with disabilities receive services in your region.

- ✓ Compare the Indicator 5C education environment rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the Indicator 5C education environment rate for the state.
  - Is the region's education environment rate higher than the state's rate?
- ✓ Compare the Indicator 5C education environment rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the education environment rate higher than the state's established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
  - Is the education environment rate higher than the state's established performance target for the 2009-2010 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the education environment rate for your region increasing each year?

### Improvement Strategies

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	Continue to provide technical assistance and support to LEAs to assist them in providing FAPE in the LRE.	Ongoing	OPI Staff CSPD Regions IHEs MPRRC Title Programs PLUK
2.	Continue to provide training for general education personnel on strategies to use in responding to students with disabilities needs in the regular education setting.	Ongoing	OPI Staff /Consultants CSPD Training Activities MPRRC Personnel Prep. Grant
3.	Provide training on the use of technology as access to the general curriculum.	Ongoing	CSPD Regions
4.	Continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs on educational practices that provide opportunities for children with disabilities to be educated with nondisabled peers.	Ongoing	CSPD Regions MPRRC Personnel Prep. Grant

### Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)

- Indicator 5A – Served inside the Regular Class for 80 Percent or more of the Day
  - The state performance target for this indicator established for the 2009-2010 school year will be: Given a minimum N of 10, **50.5 percent** of students with disabilities served inside the regular class for 80 percent or more of the day, within a 95 percent confidence interval. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

- Indicator 5B – Served inside Regular Class Less than 40 Percent of the Day
  - The state performance target for this indicator established for the 2009-2010 school year will be: Given a minimum N of 10, **11.5 percent** of students with disabilities removed from regular class greater for less than 40 percent of the day, within a 95 percent confidence interval. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.
  
- Indicator 5C – Served in Separate Facilities
  - The state performance target for this indicator established for the 2009-2010 school year will be: Given a minimum N of 10, **1.6 percent** of students with disabilities served in separate facilities, within a 95 percent confidence interval. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## **MONTANA CORRELATE 2: Assessment**

The school utilizes multiple evaluation and assessment strategies to continuously monitor and modify instruction to meet student needs and support proficient student work.

## **State Performance Indicator 3 – State Assessments**

### **Overview**

Continuing with the Academic Performance category, Montana Correlate#2 asserts effective schools use multiple evaluation and assessment strategies to meet student needs and support proficient student work. The State Performance Plan Indicator #3 evaluates district performance in supporting proficient student work by assessing district performance on AYP objective and the participation and performance of students with disabilities on state assessments. The State Performance Plan Indicator 3 is divided into three sub-indicators. All three sub-indicators are discussed below.

### **Indicator 3A – Meeting Montana’s AYP Objectives for the Disability Subgroup**

Adequate yearly progress (AYP) is measured using Montana's required 3rd-8th, and 10th-grade criterion-referenced reading and math test scores, participation, attendance, and graduation rates. Each school's test scores are divided into 10 student groups based on race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and limited English proficiency. If any of the 10 student groups does not meet any of six AYP measurements, then the entire school or district is labeled as not meeting the federal AYP requirements. Further information regarding adequate yearly progress can be found on the NCLB Report Card found at [http://www.opi.mt.gov/Reports&Data/index.html?gpm=1\\_9](http://www.opi.mt.gov/Reports&Data/index.html?gpm=1_9).

For purposes of the IDEA – Part B State Performance Plan, states are required to report on the number of districts with a minimum N of 30 for the disability subgroup meeting Montana’s AYP objectives. The state is required to evaluate and report districts meeting the State’s overall AYP objectives. The districts must meet AYP objectives in both Reading and Math content areas in order to be counted as having met overall AYP objectives.

## Target Data Analysis

Table 3.1 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established performance target for school districts meeting the AYP objectives for the disability subgroup. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 3.1 Districts Meeting Montana's AYP Objectives for the Disability Subgroup**

	Number of Districts Meeting Min N for Subgroup	Number of Districts Meeting AYP Objectives	Percent of Districts Meeting AYP Objectives	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	68	6	8.8%	17.9%	4.1%	41.0%	Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	10	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	7	1	14.3%	84.8%	0.5%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	14	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	13	1	7.7%	82.4%	0.1%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	24	4	16.7%	63.8%	2.2%		Met Target


Analysis of the target data indicates:

- The state and two CSPD/RSA regions did not meet the established performance target of **41 percent**, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- Out of 10 districts meeting the minimum N of 30 in the disability subgroup in CSPD Region I-PESA, no district met the overall AYP objectives.
- In CSPD Region III-SMART, out of 14 districts meeting the minimum N of 30 in the disability subgroup, no district met the overall AYP objectives.
- CSPD Region II-MNCESR and Region V-WM-CSPD had a **higher** percentage of districts meeting overall AYP objectives than the state.

## Trend Data Analysis

Figure 3.1 below provides trend data for the state performance plan Indicator 3A, the percent of districts with a minimum N of 30 for the disability subgroup that met the overall AYP Objectives.

**Figure 3.1 Indicator 3A Trend Data for the 2008-2009 School Year**



Analysis of the trend data indicate the five CSPD/RSA regions and the state show an average **decrease** of **35 percent** in the percent of Districts meeting AYP objectives for the disability subgroup. There are a number of factors implemented in the previous year that continue to contribute to this significant decrease.

Factors contributing to the significant decrease include:

- The targets for this indicator were established using a minimum N of 40 for the subgroups, including the disability subgroup. In the 2007-2008 school year, the U.S. Department of Education required a change from a minimum N size of 40 to a minimum N size of 30 for the subgroups.
- The change in proficiency targets used to calculate an LEA's AYP status for 2007-2008.
  - In Math, the proficiency rate targets increased by 17 percent.
  - In Reading the proficiency target increased by 9 percent.

### **Indicator 3B – Participation Rates of Students with Disabilities in State Assessments**

Participation rates of students with disabilities in assessments for both Math and Reading are reported and performance targets have been established for both Math and Reading. Participation rates are calculated by dividing the number of special education students who participated in the Math or Reading assessment by the number of students in special education in all grades assessed. The count includes all students with disabilities participating in the regular assessment (CRT), with and without accommodations, and in the alternate assessment (CRT-Alt). Non-participation could be a student who was absent and did not take an assessment, who did not obtain a valid score, who took an out-of-level test, or who did not participate for other reasons.

Note: The state participation rate formula and the performance target for participation of students with disabilities in assessments for the State Performance Plan under IDEA is not the same as used for the AYP determination.

### Target Data Analysis

Table 3.2 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established performance target for the participation rates of students with disabilities in state assessments for Reading. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

### Reading

**Table 3.2 Participation Rates of Students with Disabilities in State Assessments for Reading**

	Number of Students with Disabilities in Grades Assessed	Number of Students with Disabilities Participating in State Assessment	Percent of Students Participating in State Assessment	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	9001	8550	95.0%	95.4%	94.5%	95.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	1002	966	96.4%	97.4%	95.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	1275	1226	96.2%	97.1%	94.9%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	2027	1880	92.7%	93.8%	91.5%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	2028	1905	93.9%	94.9%	92.8%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	2656	2560	96.4%	97.0%	95.6%		Met Target

Analysis of the data provided above indicate:

- ❖ Three of the five CSPD/RSA Regions and the state have met the performance target of 95 percent of students with disabilities participating in state assessments for Reading, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- ❖ Participation rates for CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCESR, and Region V-WM-CSPD are **greater** than the established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year and the state's participation rate for Reading.

Table 3.3 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established performance target for the participation rates of students with disabilities in state assessments for Math. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

### Math

**Table 3.3 Participation Rates of Students with Disabilities in State Assessments for Math**

	Number of Students with Disabilities in Grades Assessed	Number of Students with Disabilities Participating in State Assessment	Percent of Students Participating in State Assessment	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	9001	8584	95.4%	95.8%	94.9%	95.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	1002	970	96.8%	97.7%	95.5%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	1275	1229	96.4%	97.3%	95.2%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	2027	1900	93.7%	94.7%	92.6%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	2028	1909	94.1%	95.1%	93.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	2656	2563	96.5%	97.1%	95.7%		Met Target

Analysis of the data provided above indicate:


- ❖ Four of the five CSPD/RSA Regions and the state have met the performance target of 95 percent of students with disabilities participating in state assessments for Math, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- ❖ As with Reading, participation rates for CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCESR, and Region V-WM-CSPD are **greater** that the established performance target and the state’s participation rate for Math.

## Trend Data Analysis

### Reading

Figure 3.2 provides trend data on the participation rates of students with disabilities in state assessments for Reading.

**Figure 3.2 Indicator 3B.1-Reading Participation Rate Trend Data**



Trend data indicate:


- ❖ A **decrease** in the participation of students with disabilities in state assessments between the 2007-2008 school year and the 2008-2009 school year for four of the five CSPD/RSA regions and the state.
  - A review of district data within CSPD/RSA Regions and the state show a comparable rate of decrease in the number of students with disabilities participating in the state assessment for Reading as the decrease in the number of students with disabilities enrolled between the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 school years.
    - There was a **6.6 percent decrease** in the number of students with disabilities enrolled between the two school years and a **5.9 percent decrease** in the participation of students with disabilities in the state assessment for Reading.
  - However, CSPD Region II-MNCESR showed an overall decrease of 6.9 percent in the number of students with disabilities enrolled in the 2008-2009 school

year, while at the same time there was a 0.5 percent *increase* in the number of students participating in state assessments.

**Math**

Figure 3.3 provides trend data on the participation rates of students with disabilities in state assessments for Math.

**Figure 3.3 Indicator 3B.2- Math Participation Rate Trend Data**



Trend data indicate:

- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA and CSPD Region II-MNCESR show an **increase** in the participation of students with disabilities on the state assessment for Math from the previous year.
- ❖ CSPD Region III-SMART, Region IV-RESA4U, Region V-WM-CSPD, and the state show a **decrease** in the participation of students with disabilities on the state assessment for Math from the previous year.

**Indicator 3C – Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on State Assessments**

Proficiency rates of students with disabilities in assessments for both Math and Reading are reported and performance targets have been established in the subject areas of Math and Reading. Proficiency rates are calculated by dividing the number of special education students scoring Proficient or Advanced in the Math assessment by the number of students in all grades assessed. This count includes all students with disabilities who scored proficient or above in the regular assessment (CRT) with or without accommodations, as well as those who scored proficient or above in the alternate assessment (CRT-Alt).

## Target Data Analysis

Table 3.4 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established *performance target* for proficiency rates of students with disabilities on reading assessments. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 3.4 Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on Reading Assessments**

	Number of Students with Disabilities in Grades Assessed	Number of Students with Disabilities - Proficient or Above	Proficiency Rate for Students with Disabilities	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	8583	3951	46.0%	47.1%	45.0%	33.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	937	382	40.8%	45.8%	36.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	1224	480	39.2%	43.7%	35.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	1918	886	46.2%	49.5%	42.9%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	1945	950	48.8%	52.0%	45.7%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	2547	1244	48.8%	51.6%	46.1%		Met Target

Target data indicate:

- ❖ Within the CSPD/RSA regions, the percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on reading assessments range from a **high** of **48.8 percent** to a **low** of **39.2 percent**.
- ❖ The state and all CSPD/RSA regions meet the established performance target of **33 percent** will score proficient or above on state Reading assessments, within a 95 percent confidence interval.

## Math

Table 3.5 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established *performance target* for proficiency rates of students with disabilities on math assessments. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 3.5 Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on Math Assessments**

	Number of Students with Disabilities in Grades Assessed	Number of Students with Disabilities - Proficient or Above	Proficiency Rate for Students with Disabilities	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	8583	2390	27.8%	28.8%	26.9%	33.0%	Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	937	214	22.8%	28.9%	17.7%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	1224	302	24.7%	29.8%	20.1%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	1918	508	26.5%	30.5%	22.8%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	1945	569	29.3%	33.1%	25.7%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	2547	792	31.1%	34.4%	28.0%		Met Target

Target data indicate:


- ❖ Within the CSPD/RSA regions, the percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on math assessments range from a **high** of **31.1 percent** to a **low** of **22.8 percent**.
- ❖ The state, CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCESR, and Region III-SMART did not meet the established performance target of **33 percent** of students with disabilities will score proficient or above on state math assessments, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- ❖ CSPD Region IV-RESA4U and Region V-WM-CSPD have met the established performance target of **33 percent**.

## Trend Data Analysis

### Reading

Figure 3.5 provides trend data on the proficiency rates of students with disabilities on state reading assessments.

**Figure 3.4 Indicator 3C-Reading Assessment Trend Data**




Trend data indicate that:

- ❖ Proficiency rates for students with disabilities have *increased* for the 2008-2009 school year for all of the CSPD/RSA regions, resulting in an overall *increase* in students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on reading assessments in the state.
- ❖ Within all CSPD/RSA regions, the percent of increase of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state reading assessments range from a **high** of **3.8 percent** to a **low** of **1.3 percent**.

## Math

Figure 3.6 provides trend data on the proficiency rates of students with disabilities on state math assessments.

**Table 3. 6 Indicator 3C-Math Assessment Trend Data**



Target data indicates:

- ❖ CSPD Region III-SMART, Region IV-RESA4U, Region V-WM-CSPD, and the state show an **increase** in the percent of students with disabilities scoring proficient or above on state math assessments from the previous year.
- ❖ The increase in proficiency rates for three of the CSPD/RSA regions and the state range from a **high** of **3.4 percent** to a **low** of **1.7 percent**.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA and CSPD Region II-MNCESR both show minor **decreases** in proficiency rates of **.3 percent** and **.1 percent**, respectively.

## Needs Assessment

Even if your CSPD/RSA region has met the state performance targets for the 2008-2009 school year, there still may be a need to improve the participation and performance of students with disabilities in state assessments within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact the participation and performance of students with disabilities in state assessments within your region.

- ✓ Compare the participation rate and the proficiency rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the participation and performance rates for the state.
  - Is the participation rate lower than the state's participation rate?
  - Is the proficiency rate lower than the state's proficiency rate?

- ✓ Compare the participation rate and the proficiency rate for your CSPD/RSA Region to the established performance targets.
  - Is the participation rate lower than the established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
  - Is the proficiency rate lower than the established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
  - Is the participation rate lower than the established performance target for the 2009-2010 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
  - Is the proficiency rate lower than the established performance target for the 2009-2010 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
  
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the participation rate for your region decreasing each year?
  - Does the trend data show the proficiency rate decreasing each year?
  - Does the trend data show that the participation rate is decreasing while the proficiency rate is increasing?

A considerable decrease in the participation rates of students with disabilities with a comparable increase in the proficiency rates could be a cause for concern. Due to the significant decrease in participation rates for students with disabilities, it is difficult to determine the merit of an increase in proficiency rates without understanding the characteristics of the group of non-participants.

### Improvement Strategies

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	Provide professional development opportunities to LEAs on research-based strategies to improve student achievement.	Ongoing	OPI Staff CSPD Regions OPI Staff ESEA Staff Personnel Prep. Grant (SPDG) MPRRC
2.	Continue to implement MBI to promote a positive environment which supports student learning	Ongoing	CSPD Regions OPI School Foods OPI Staff Board of Crime Control University of Montana/DERS Department of Emergency Services

## Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)

- Indicator 3A – Percent of Districts Meeting AYP Objectives for the Disability Subgroup
  - The state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year for this indicator will be **41 percent**. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.
- Indicator 3B.1 – Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities in State Reading Assessments
  - The state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year for this indicator will be **95 percent**. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.
- Indicator 3B.2 – Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities in State Math Assessments
  - The state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year for this indicator will be **95 percent**. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.
- Indicator 3C.1– Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on State Reading Assessments
  - The state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year for this indicator will be **33 percent**. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.
- Indicator 3C.2– Proficiency Rates of Students with Disabilities on State Math Assessments
  - The state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year for this indicator will be **33 percent**. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## MONTANA CORRELATE 3: Instruction

The school's instructional program actively engages all students by using effective, varied, and research-based practices to improve student academic performance.

## State Performance Indicator 1 – Graduation Rates

### Overview

Montana Correlate #3 asserts an effective school uses effective, varied, and research-based instructional programs that actively engages all students.

The State Performance Indicator #1 evaluates the effectiveness of the instructional program for students with disabilities by assessing improvements in graduation rates as students actively engaged in the instructional program will stay in school and graduate.

The measurement for this indicator has been revised for the Annual Performance Report submitted February 1, 2010. States are required to report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). **Therefore, the data source for this indicator is now the data reported through the AIM system and we reported the data for the 2007-2008 school year rather than the 2008-2009 school year. The result is that data for this indicator will always be a year behind the data for other indicators.**

Montana's U.S. Department of Education-approved high school graduation rate is an estimated cohort group rate. It utilizes both dropout and graduate data and uses data from four consecutive years. **Special education graduates** are the count of individuals who :

1) completed the high school graduation requirements of a school district, including early graduates, during the previous school year, or 2) completed the high school graduation requirements of a school district at the end of the summer prior to the current school year. **Special education school leaver cohorts** are the students with disabilities graduating in the current school year plus the number of dropouts and other completers of high school. Other high school completers include graduates receiving a standard high school diploma in more than the standard number of years and students receiving district-approved GEDs.

### Target Data Analysis

Table 1.1 below provides an evaluation of performance by CSPD region and the state in relation to the established performance target for graduation rates.

**Please Note: These evaluations are based on the 2007-2008 school year as required by the U.S. Department of Education.**

**Table 1. 1 Graduation Rates for Students with Disabilities for the 2007-2008 School Year**

	School Leaver Cohort Total	Graduate Count for Special Education	Completion Rate for Special Education	Confidence Interval - High	Confidence Interval - Low	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	1216	934	76.8%	79.1%	74.4%	80.0%	Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	122	96	78.7%	85.7%	69.5%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	205	152	74.1%	80.5%	66.7%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	288	220	76.4%	81.5%	70.4%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	252	199	79.0%	84.1%	72.8%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	348	266	76.4%	81.1%	71.0%		Met Target

Highlights of a review of the target data for the 2007-2008 school year are as follows:

- The state has not met the state's established performance target of **80 percent** of students with disabilities will graduate high school, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- All CSPD/RSA Regions have met the established performance target of **80 percent** of students with disabilities will graduate high school, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- Graduation rates for the CSPD/RSA regions range from a *low* of **74.1 percent** to a *high* of **79 percent**.

### Trend Data Analysis

Trend data is not provided at this time due to a change in the measurement of this indicator. In prior years, graduation rate calculation used the Part B 618 data and a leaver graduation rate formula as recommended by Westat. Part B 618 exiting data is a 12-month reporting year, collected at the end of June. The requirement to use the same graduation rate calculation and timelines as ESEA requires us to use a different set of data. The ESEA data collection is collected annually in October for the previous year. The difference in data collection timelines prevents us from making comparisons of the graduation rate for students with disabilities from prior years.

### Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance target for the 2007-2008 school year, there still may be a need to improve graduation rates for students with disabilities within a specific CSPD region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact graduation rates for students with disabilities in your region.

- ✓ Compare the graduation rate for your CSPD/RSA region in relation to the graduation rate for the state.
  - Is the graduation rate for your region lower than the state's graduation rate?
- ✓ Compare the graduation rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the graduation rate lower than the state's established performance target for the 2007-2008 school year?
  - Is the graduation rate lower than the state's established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region, when available.
  - Does the trend data show the graduation rate for your region is decreasing each year?

### Improvement Strategies

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	Through the Montana Behavioral Initiative (MBI), provide training to LEA staff regarding improving school climate, instructional techniques, and implementing schoolwide approaches to positive behavioral intervention and support.	Ongoing	CSPD Regions OPI School Foods OPI Staff Board of Crime Control University of Montana/DERS Department of Emergency Services
2.	Through the Montana Behavioral Initiative (MBI) Youth Days, provide training to youth in character education and service learning.	Ongoing	CSPD Regions OPI School Foods OPI Staff Board of Crime Control University of Montana/DERS Department of Emergency Services
3.	Provide professional development opportunities to enhance LEAs' knowledge and implementation of effective strategies to improve graduation rates.	Ongoing	National Dropout Prevention Center OPI Staff MPRRC National Technical Assistance Centers SPDG CSPD
4.	Continue to provide professional development, technical assistance and support to LEAs in the development of transition services as a part of students' IEP.	Ongoing	OPI Staff Contracted Personnel MPRRC CSPD NSTTAC

### Performance Target (2008-2009 School Year)

The state performance target for the 2008-2009 school year will be **80 percent**. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## State Performance Indicator 2 – Dropout Rates

### Overview

The State Performance Indicator #2 – Dropout rates is another way to evaluate an effective instructional program (Montana Correlate #3) by assessing improvement in the percent of students with disabilities dropping out of school.

As with graduation rates, the data source and measurement for this indicator has been revised to align with the ESEA reporting timelines and dropout rate calculation. There is a one-year data lag for this indicator. **Therefore, data is for the 2007-2008 school year rather than the 2008-2009 school year.**

The special education dropout rate calculation is an event rate (a snapshot of those who drop out in a single year) adapted from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) at the U.S. Department of Education. The dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of special education dropouts, grades 7-12, by the number of students with disabilities, grades 7-12, enrolled in school as of the first Monday in October.

### Target Data Analysis

Table 2.1 provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the established performance target for dropout rates. These evaluations are based on the 2007-2008 school year.

**Table 2. 1 Dropout Rates for Students with Disabilities for the 2007-2008 School Year.**

	Special Education Student Count, Grades 7-12	Special Education Dropout Count	Dropout Rate for Special Education	Confidence Interval - High	Confidence Interval - Low	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	7626	346	4.5%	5.0%	4.1%	5.1%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	821	31	3.8%	17.0%	0.7%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	1241	52	4.2%	13.5%	1.2%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	1813	89	4.9%	11.5%	2.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	1599	80	5.0%	12.2%	2.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	2136	94	4.4%	10.6%	1.7%		Met Target

A review of the data shows:

- The state and all CSPD/RSA regions have met the established performance target of **5.1 percent** of students with disabilities dropping out of school, within a 95 percent confidence interval.
- Dropout rates for the CSPD/RSA regions ranged from a *high* of **5.0 percent** to a *low* of **3.8 percent**.

## Trend Data Analysis

Trend data is not provided at this time due to a change in the data source for this indicator. In prior years, the dropout rate calculation used the Part B 618 data. Part B 618 exiting data is a 12-month reporting year, collected at the end of June. The requirement to use the same dropout rate calculation and timelines as ESEA requires us to use a different set of data. The ESEA data collection for dropouts is collected annually in October for the previous year. The difference in data collection source and timelines prevents us from making comparisons of the dropout rate for students with disabilities from prior years.

## Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance target for the 2007-2008 school year, there still may be a need to reduce dropout rates for students with disabilities within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact dropout rates for students with disabilities in your region.

- ✓ Compare the dropout rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the dropout rate for the state.
  - Is the dropout rate higher than the state's dropout rate?
- ✓ Compare the dropout rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the dropout rate higher than the state's established performance target for the 2007-2008 school year?
  - Is the dropout rate higher than the state's established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region, when available.
  - Does the trend data show the dropout rate for your region increasing each year?

## Improvement Strategies

The CSPD/RSA regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	Through the Montana Behavioral Initiative (MBI), provide training to LEA staff regarding improving school climate, instructional techniques, and implementing schoolwide approaches to positive behavioral intervention and support.	Ongoing	CSPD Regions OPI School Foods OPI Staff Board of Crime Control University of Montana/DERS Department of Emergency Services

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
2.	Through the Montana Behavioral Initiative (MBI) Youth Days, provide training to youth in character education and service learning.	Ongoing	CSPD Regions OPI School Foods OPI Staff Board of Crime Control University of Montana/DERS Department of Emergency Services
3.	Provide professional development opportunities to enhance LEAs' knowledge and implementation of effective strategies to decrease student dropouts.	Ongoing	National Dropout Prevention Center OPI Staff MPRRC National Technical Assistance Centers SPDG CSPD

### **Performance Target (2008-2009 School Year)**

Finally, the state performance target established for the 2008-2009 school year will be to decrease the dropout rate for students with disabilities to **5.0 percent**. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## **LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

### **MONTANA CORRELATE 4: School Culture**

The school/district functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.

### **Indicator 4A – Suspension and Expulsion Rates**

#### **Overview**

Montana Correlate #4 asserts an effective school functions as an effective learning community and supports a climate conducive to performance excellence.

The State Performance Indicator #5 evaluates whether the school can be considered an effective learning community with a climate conducive to performance excellence by looking at the long-term suspension/expulsion rates of students with disabilities.

The OPI compares the long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities to the long-term suspension and expulsion rates for nondisabled students in order to determine if there is a *significant discrepancy* occurring with respect to long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities.

#### **Long-term Suspension or Expulsion Definition**

A suspension or expulsion that results in removal of a student, out-of-school, for greater than 10 school days or a student with multiple short-term (10 school days or less) out-of-school suspensions or expulsions that sum to greater than 10 school days during the school year.

#### **Significant Discrepancy Definition**

An LEA is determined to have a significant discrepancy if, given a minimum N of 10, an LEA demonstrates a statistical difference in long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities when compared to the long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students without disabilities, within a 99 percent confidence interval.

## Target Data Analysis

Table 4.1 below provides an evaluation of regional and state performance related to the state's established performance target for the percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the long-term suspension and expulsion rates of students with disabilities. These evaluations are based on the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 4.1 State and CSPD/RSA Region Performance on Long-Term Suspension and Expulsion Rates**

	Number of LEAs (a)	Number of LEAs identified with significant discrepancy (b)	Percent of LEAs identified with significant discrepancy (b/a)*100	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	419	0	0.0%	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	89	0	0.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	80	0	0.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	84	0	0.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	86	0	0.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	80	0	0.0%		Met Target

A review of the data in Table 4.1 above shows the following:

- The state and the five CSPD/RSA regions have met the established performance target of **0 percent** of districts identified with significant discrepancy in long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities.
  - This is a compliance indicator meaning that the state performance target will be 0 percent of districts will be identified as having significant discrepancy every year.

Table 4.2 below provides a comparison between the long-term suspension and expulsion rates of students with disabilities and the rates of students without disabilities used in the calculation of significant discrepancy.

**Table 4.2 Long-Term Suspension and Expulsion Rates for the 2008-2009 School Year**

	Special Education Child Count	Number of Special Education Students with Long-term Suspension or Expulsion	Special Education Long-term Suspension or Expulsion Rates	General Education Enrollment	Number of Regular Education Students with Long-term Suspension or Expulsion	Regular Education Long-term Suspension and Expulsion Rates
State of Montana	16089	97	0.6%	126674	339	0.3%
CSPD Region I - PESA	1738	16	0.9%	11443	47	0.4%
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	2447	17	0.7%	19839	113	0.6%
CSPD Region III - SMART	3403	24	0.7%	26932	69	0.3%
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	3478	9	0.3%	30541	51	0.2%
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	4541	13	0.3%	36949	77	0.2%

An analysis of target data indicates the following:

- ❖ The long-term suspension and expulsion rate for students with disabilities continues to be greater than the long-term suspension and expulsion rate for students without


disabilities. Although statistical analysis indicate the difference between the two rates are not statistically significant.

- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCESR, and Region III-SMART all have long-term suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities that are **greater than** the state’s long-term suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities.
- ❖ CSPD Region IV-RESA4U and Region V-WM-CSPD have long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities that are **less than** the state's long-term suspension and expulsion rate for students with disabilities.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA and Region II-MNCESR have long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students without disabilities that are **greater than** the state's long-term suspension and expulsion rate for students without disabilities.
- ❖ CSPD Region III-SMART has long-term suspension/expulsion rate for students without disabilities comparable to the state’s long-term suspension/expulsion rate for students without disabilities.
- ❖ CSPD Region IV-RESA4U and Region V-WM-CSPD have long-term suspension/expulsion rates for students without disabilities that are **less than** the state’s long-term suspension/expulsion rates for student without disabilities.

### Trend Data Analysis

Figure 4.1 below provides a look at trend data for long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the CSPD/RSA regions and the state.

**Figure 4.1 Trend Data for Long-term Suspension/Expulsion Rates**



Trend data indicate:

- ❖ CSPD Region II-MNCESR and Region IV-RESA4U show a **decrease** in the long-term suspension/expulsion rates of students with disabilities from the previous year.

- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA and CSPD Region III-SMART show an **increase** in the long-term suspension/expulsion rates of students with disabilities from the previous year.
- ❖ CSPD Region V-WM-CSPD and the state show a long-term suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities comparable to the previous year.

### Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance target for the 2008-2009 school year, there still may be a need to provide professional development opportunities that address the suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact the long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities in your region.

- ✓ Compare the long-term suspension and expulsion rate for students with disabilities for your CSPD/RSA region to the long-term suspension and expulsion rate for the state.
  - Is the regional suspension/expulsion rate higher than the state's suspension/expulsion rate?
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the long-term suspension and expulsion rate for students with disabilities in your region increasing each year?

### Improvement Strategies

CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	Continue to make MBI training available to school personnel.	Ongoing	CSPD Regions OPI School Foods OPI Staff Board of Crime Control University of Montana/DERS Dept. of Emergency Services
2.	Work with the Division of Indian Education to identify promising practices to decrease long-term suspensions and/or expulsions for American Indian students.	Ongoing	OPI Staff CSPD

### Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)

As stated earlier, Indicator 4A is a compliance indicator. This means that the state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year will be **0 percent** of the districts in the state will be identified as having significant discrepancies in the long-term suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## **MONTANA CORRELATE 5: Student, Family, and Community Support**

The school/district works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning in an effort to meet the intellectual, social, career, and developmental needs of students.

### **Indicator 8 – Parent Involvement**

#### **Overview**

Montana Correlate #5 asserts that an effective school works with families and community groups to remove barriers to learning. State Performance Indicator #8 evaluates the collaboration with families by assessing the extent to which parents of students with disabilities report the school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

The OPI employs a sampling methodology to gather data for this indicator that is aligned with the five-year compliance monitoring cycle. Therefore, district performance for this indicator is only reported for districts monitored in the year in which data is being reported (see Compliance Monitoring Schedule in Appendix for list of schools monitored in the 2009-2010 school year).

To report on this indicator, each of the survey respondents received a percent of maximum score based on their responses to the 26 items on the survey. A parent who has a percent of maximum score of 60 percent or above is identified as one who, on average, agrees with each item; as such, the family member is agreeing that the school facilitated their involvement.

The parent involvement rate is calculated by dividing the number of respondent parents who report the school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities.

#### **Target Data Analysis**

For schools to be monitored in the 2009-10 school year, all parents of students, ages 3-21, receiving special education services during the 2008-09 school year were asked to complete and then mail the survey to Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC). Parents were assured of anonymity. A total of 4,785 surveys were distributed and 1,139 were returned for a response rate of 23.8 percent.

Table 8.1 below provides an evaluation of region and state performance related to the established performance target for the percent of parents who report that the school facilitated parental involvement as a way to improve services and results for students with disabilities. This evaluation is based on survey data from the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 8. 1 Results of Parent Involvement Survey for the 2008-2009 School Year**

	Total Number of Parent Respondents	Number who reported school facilitated their involvement	Percent who reported school facilitated their involvement	Confidence Interval - Upper Limit	Confidence Interval - Lower Limit	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	1139	830	72.9%	75.4%	70.2%	66.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	103	69	67.0%	76.9%	55.3%		Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	159	111	69.8%	77.6%	60.7%		Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	97	67	69.1%	78.9%	57.2%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	238	168	70.6%	77.0%	63.3%		Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	542	415	76.6%	80.4%	72.3%		Met Target


Analysis of target data shows the following:

- ❖ The state and the five CSPD/RSA regions have met the established performance target of **66 percent** of parents report the school facilitated parental involvement as a means to improve services and results for students with disabilities.
- ❖ Within the CSDP/RSA regions, the parent involvement rate range from a **high** of **76.6 percent** to a **low** of **67 percent**.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCER, Region III-SMART and Region IV-RESA4U have a parent involvement rate **lower** than the state's parent involvement rate.
- ❖ CSPD Region V-WM-CSPD has a parent involvement rate **greater** than the state's parent involvement rate.

**Trend Data Analysis**

Figure 8.1 below provides trend data on the percent of parents reporting the school facilitated parent involvement.

**Figure 8. 1 Performance Indicator 8 Trend Data for the State and CSPD Regions**



Analysis of the trend data indicates the following:

- ❖ Within all CSPD/RSA regions, the percent of **increase** of the parent involvement rate from the previous year ranges from a **high** of a 24.1 percent increase to a **low** of 3.4 percent increase.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA shows the largest increase of the parent involvement rate from the previous year.
- ❖ CSPD Region IV-RESA4U show the smallest increase of the parent involvement rate from the previous year.

### Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance target for the 2008-2009 school year, there still may be a need to improve parent involvement within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact school-facilitated parent involvement for students with disabilities in your region.

- ✓ Compare the parent involvement rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the parent involvement rate for the state.
  - Is the parent involvement rate lower than the state's parent involvement rate?
- ✓ Compare the parent involvement rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the parent involvement rate lower than the state's established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
  - Is the parent involvement rate lower than the state's established performance target for the 2009-2010 school year?
    - (Find out what the target is for next year under the heading *Performance Target* below.)
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the parent involvement rate for your region decreasing each year?

### Improvement Strategies

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	The OPI, with the support of its regional CSPD structure, will share strategies and best practices with school personnel and LEAs on improving parental involvement.	Ongoing	CSPD MPRRC PLUK OPI

### Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)

The state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year will be **67 percent** of parents surveyed will report the school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

### State Performance Indicator 11 – Child Find

#### Overview

The State Performance Indicator #11 is another way to evaluate the collaboration with families and community groups (Montana Correlate # 5) by assessing whether districts have evaluated children referred for evaluation within the established timeline.

The OPI employs a sampling methodology to gather data for this indicator that is aligned with the five-year compliance monitoring cycle. Therefore, ***school district performance for this indicator is only reported for districts monitored in the year in which data is being reported.*** During the compliance monitoring process, the OPI reviews a sample of student records for students who have been initially evaluated for special education services. This review includes a comparison of the date of the school district’s receipt of written parent permission for evaluation to the date that the evaluation was completed to ensure that the evaluation was conducted in accord with the 60-day timeline.

The evaluation rate is calculated by dividing the number of reviewed IEPs for students whose eligibility was determined within the 60-day timeline by the total number of reviewed IEPs for students for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

#### Target Data Analysis

The table below provides an evaluation of region and state performance related to the established performance target for this indicator. This evaluation is based on data from the 2008-2009 school year. This is a compliance indicator meaning that the performance target is **100 percent** of children, with parental consent to evaluate, will be evaluated within 60 days unless there was an exception to the timeframe in accord with the provisions stated in Sec. 614(a)(1)(C)(ii).

**Table 11.1 State and CSPD Region Performance Status**

	Number of Children for whom Parent Consent was Received	Number of Children whose Evaluations were Completed within 60 days	Percent of Children with Parent Consent Evaluated within 60 days	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	154	139	90.3%	100.0%	Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	10	5	50.0%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	29	27	93.1%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	16	16	100.0%		Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	36	33	91.7%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	63	58	92.1%		Did Not Meet Target


An analysis of the target data indicates:

- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCESR, Region IV-RESA4U, Region V-WM-CSPD, and the state **did not meet** the established performance target of **100 percent** of children, with parental consent, will be evaluated within 60 days.
- ❖ CSPD Region III-SMART **did meet** the established performance target of **100 percent** of children, with parental consent, will be evaluated within 60 days.
- ❖ Within the CSPD/RSA regions, the percent of children, with parental consent, evaluated within 60 days ranged from a **high** of **100 percent** to a **low** of **50 percent**.

### Trend Data Analysis

Figure 11.1 below provides trend data on the percent of children evaluated within 60 days for the state and the CSPD/RSA regions.

**Figure 11.1 Indicator 11 Trend Data for the State and the CSPD/RSA Regions**



An analysis of the trend data indicates the following:

- ❖ Within the CSPD/RSA regions, the percent of **decrease** the 2007-2008 school year and the 2008-2009 school year range from a **high** of **38.9 percent** to a **low** of **1.1 percent**.
- ❖ The state shows an overall **decrease** between the 2007-2008 school year and the 2008-2009 school year of **0.8 percent**.

### Needs Assessment

Four of the CSPD/RSA regions and the state did not meet the established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year for this indicator. In addition, four of the five CSPD regions (CSPD Region I-PESA, Region II-MNCESR, Region III-SMART, and Region V-WM-CSPD) and the state did not meet the state performance target in the 2007-2008 school year. Failure to meet the established performance target indicates a potential need to

provide professional development activities in the timeliness of referral and eligibility determinations.

In addition, if you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact the referral and eligibility determinations for students with disabilities in your region.

- ✓ Compare the evaluation rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the evaluation rate for the state.
  - Is the evaluation rate lower than the state's evaluation rate?
- ✓ Compare the evaluation rate for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the evaluation rate lower than the state's established performance target for the 2008-2009 school year?
  - Is the evaluation rate lower than the state's established performance target of 100 percent?
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the evaluation rate for your region decreasing each year?

### Improvement Strategies

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	Provide technical assistance and training to LEAs on timeline requirements.	Ongoing	OPI Staff CSPD MPRRC
2.	The OPI will work with PLUK to ensure parents are knowledgeable of the 60-day timeline.	Ongoing	OPI Staff CSPD PLUK

### Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)

As stated earlier, Indicator 11 is a compliance indicator. This means that the State Performance Target established for the 2009-2010 school year will be **100 percent** of the children, with parental consent to evaluate, are evaluated within 60 days unless there is an exception to the timeframe in accord with the provisions in Sec. 614(a)(1)(C)(ii). State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## INDICATOR 12 – Part C to Part B Transition

### Overview

The State Performance Indicator #12 evaluates collaboration with families and community groups (Montana Correlate # 5) by assessing the efforts of Part C providers and school districts in providing a seamless transition between Part C special education services and Part B special education services by the child's third birthday.

In collaboration with the lead agency for the IDEA Part C Early Intervention Program, the OPI collects data from specific school districts in order to evaluate performance for this indicator. Therefore, **performance data reported are for those districts who received a referral for IDEA Part B eligibility determination from the IDEA Part C Early Intervention Program.**

The OPI receives child-specific referral data from each Part C provider that includes the name of the LEA receiving the referral and the date of the referral. The OPI contacts each LEA to collect additional data, including the following: date of eligibility meeting, eligibility determination outcome, date of the initial IEP, and any reasons for delay if the initial IEP was not implemented by the child’s third birthday.

The indicator rate, the percent of children found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday, is calculated by dividing the number of children found eligible and have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday by the number of children referred by Part C to Part B for eligibility determination.

### Target Data Analysis

The table below provides an evaluation of region and state performance related to the established performance target for this indicator. This evaluation is based on data from the 2008-2009 school year. This is a compliance indicator meaning that the state’s performance target will be **100 percent** for each year of the State Performance Plan.

**Table 12.1 State and CSPD/RSA Region Performance Status**

	Number of Children Referred by Part C to Part B for Eligibility Determination	Number of Children found Eligible for Part B and Who Have an IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday	Percent of Children Referred by Part C Prior to Age 3, Who Have An IEP Developed and Implemented by Their Third Birthday	SPP Performance Target	SPP Performance Status
State of Montana	139	98	70.5%	100.0%	Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region I - PESA	15	5	33.3%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	29	24	82.8%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	35	26	74.3%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	23	17	73.9%		Did Not Meet Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	37	26	70.3%		Did Not Meet Target


An analysis of the target data indicates:

- ❖ All five CSPD/RSA regions and the state did not meet the established performance target of 100 percent of children found eligible for Part B have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
- ❖ Within all of the CSPD/RSA regions, the percent of children found eligible for Part B have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday ranges from a **high** of **82.8 percent** and a **low** of **33.3 percent**.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA and CSPD Region V-WM-CSPD have indicator rates *lower* than the state’s indicator rate of **70.5 percent**.
- ❖ CSPD Region II-MNCESR, CSPD Region III-SMART, and CSPD Region IV-RESA4U have indicator rates *higher* than the state’s indicator rate.

## Trend Data Analysis

Figure 12.1 below provides trend data on the percent of children found eligible for Part B who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday for the state and the CSPD/RSA regions.

**Figure 12. 1 Indicator 12 Trend Data for the State and the CSPD Regions**



The trend data indicate the following:

- ❖ CSPD Region II-MNCESR and Region III-SMART show an increase in the percent of children with IEPs prior to their third birthday.
- ❖ CSPD Region I-PESA, Region IV-RESA4U, and Region V-WM-CSPD show a decrease in the percent of children with IEPs prior to their third birthday.
- ❖ Within all CSPD/RSA Regions, the percent of decrease ranges from a **high** of 33.3 percent to a **low** of 1 percent. The percent of increase ranges from a **high** of 18.4 percent to a **low** of 2 percent.

## Needs Assessment

All five of the CSPD/RSA regions and the state **did not meet the state performance target** for the 2008-2009 school year for this indicator. In addition, all five CSPD/RSA regions and the state did not meet the state performance target in the 2007-2008 school year. Failure to meet the established performance target in multiple years indicates a potential need for professional development activities in the area of early childhood transition.

In addition, if you answer yes to any of the questions below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact early childhood transition in your region.

- ✓ Compare the percent with IEPs for your CSPD/RSA region to the percent with IEPs for the state.
  - Is the percent with IEPs lower than the state's percent with IEPs?
- ✓ Compare the percent with IEPs for your CSPD/RSA region to the established performance target.
  - Is the percent with IEPs lower than the state's established performance target of 100 percent?
- ✓ Review the trend data for your CSPD/RSA region.
  - Does the trend data show the percent with IEPs for your region decreasing each year?

### **Improvement Strategies**

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
	Continue to provide TA and training on effective child find practices and transition from Part C to Part B.	Ongoing	CSPD Activities OPI DDPHS/Part C Staff

### **Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)**

As stated earlier, Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator. This means that the state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year will be **100 percent** of students referred by Part C and eligible for Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## **EFFICIENCY**

### **MONTANA CORRELATE 7: Leadership**

School/district instructional decisions focus on support for teaching and learning, organizational direction, high performance expectations, creating a learning culture, and developing leadership capacity.

### **State Performance Indicator 9 – Disproportionate Representation**

#### **Overview**

Montana Correlate #7 asserts the instructional decisions of an effective school focus on support for teaching and learning, organizational direction, high performance expectations, creating a learning culture, and developing leadership capacity.

The State Performance Indicator #9 evaluates school district instructional decisions to assess whether disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services found in the school is the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices.

Measurement for this indicator, as reported in the Annual Performance Report, is the percent of districts identified as having a disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification practices. This is a compliance indicator meaning that the target for each year of the State Performance Plan will be 0 percent of districts have been identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification procedures.

**Definition of Disproportionate Representation**

An LEA is determined to have **disproportionate representation** (under or over) if, given a minimum N of 10 and within a 99 percent confidence interval, an LEA demonstrates a statistically significant difference in the proportion of students with disabilities of a specific racial/ethnic group receiving special education and related services compared to the proportion of students with disabilities in all other racial/ethnic groups receiving special education and related services in that LEA.

Once an LEA is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

**Target Data Analysis**

Table 9.1 below provides an evaluation of region and state performance related to the established performance target for the percent of districts identified as having a disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification procedures. This evaluation is based on data from the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 9. 1 District Review of Disproportionate Representation by CSPD Region**

	Number of School Districts Reviewed	Number Districts Identified With Disproportionate Representation (a)	Number Districts Identified with Disproportionate Representation Due to Inappropriate Identification (b)	Percent of Districts Identified with Disproportionate Representation Due to Inappropriate Identification Procedures % = (b/a)*100	SPP Performance Status
<b>State of Montana</b>	420	1	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>Met Target</b>
CSPD Region I - PESA	90	0	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	80	0	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	84	1	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	85	0	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	81	0	0	0.0%	Met Target

A review of the data above indicates the following:

- ❖ One school districts is identified as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education. But after a review of policies, practices, and procedures, there are **no school districts** identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups **due to inappropriate identification practices**.
- ❖ Therefore, all CSPD regions and the state have met this state performance target.

The table below provides information on the racial/ethnic group and type of disproportionate representation for the one school district.

**Table 9.2 Districts Identified with Disproportionate Representation**

CSPD Region	School District	Racial and Ethnic Group	Disproportionate Representation Status
CSPD Region III - SMART	District A	American Indian/Alaskan Native	Over-Representation

### Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance target for the 2008-2009 school year, there still may be a need to address disproportionate representation within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to the question below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact the identification of students with disabilities in your region.

- ✓ Are there school districts within your region identified with disproportionate representation for specific racial and ethnic groups (see Table 9.2)?

### Improvement Strategies

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	The OPI will provide comprehensive training to selected LEAs regarding the use of Response to Intervention (RtI).	Ongoing	OPI staff Consultants University of Montana CSPD
2.	Provide technical assistance to schools in collaboration with the Division of Indian Education for All on instructional strategies in general education that may lead to fewer American Indian students identified as needing special education.	Ongoing	OPI staff CSPD

### Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)

State Performance Indicator 9 is a compliance indicator. This means that the state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year will be **0 percent** of the districts in the state will be identified as having disproportionate representation in specific racial and ethnic groups due to inappropriate identification procedures. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## State Performance Indicator 10 – Disproportionate Representation - Disability Categories

### Overview

The State Performance Indicator #10 also evaluates school district instructional decisions (Montana Correlate #7) by assessing whether disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services within a specific disability category found in the school is the result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices.

Again, this indicator is a compliance indicator meaning that the target for each year of the State Performance Plan will be 0 percent of districts have been identified as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification procedures.

### Definition of Disproportionate Representation

An LEA is determined to have **disproportionate representation** (under or over) if, given a minimum N of 10, an LEA demonstrates a statistically significant difference in the proportion of students with disabilities of racial and ethnic groups within a specific disability category receiving special education and related services compared to the proportion of students with disabilities of all other racial and ethnic groups and within all other disability categories receiving special education and related services in that LEA, within a 99 percent confidence interval.

Once an LEA is flagged for disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

### Target Data Analysis

Table 10.1 below provides an evaluation of region and state performance related to the established performance target for the percent of districts identified as having a disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification procedures. This evaluation is based on data from the 2008-2009 school year.

**Table 10. 1 Districts Identified with Disproportionate Representation-Specific Disabilities**

	Number of School Districts Reviewed	Number Districts Identified With Disproportionate Representation (a)	Number Districts Identified with Disproportionate Representation Due to Inappropriate Identification (b)	Percent of Districts Identified with Disproportionate Representation Due to Inappropriate Identification Procedures $\% = (b/a) * 100$	SPP Performance Status
<b>State of Montana</b>	420	0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>Met Target</b>
CSPD Region I - PESA	90	0	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region II - MNCESR	80	0	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region III - SMART	84	0	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region IV - RESA4U	85	0	0	0.0%	Met Target
CSPD Region V - WM-CSPD	81	0	0	0.0%	Met Target

A review of the data above indicates the following:

- ❖ There were ***no school districts*** identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories ***due to inappropriate identification practices***.
- ❖ All CSPD/RSA regions and the state have met this state performance target.

### Needs Assessment

Although all CSPD/RSA regions have met the state performance target for the 2008-2009 school year, there still may be a need to address disproportionate representation within a specific CSPD/RSA region.

If you answer yes to the question below, it may be important to explore professional development activities that might impact the identification of students with disabilities in your region.

- ✓ Are there school districts within your region identified with disproportionate representation for specific racial and ethnic groups and disability categories (see Table 10.1)?

### Improvement Strategies

The CSPD regions are identified in the State Performance Plan as a resource for assisting with the following improvement activities for this performance indicator. This information is provided to help guide the planning of professional development activities that will be aligned with established improvement strategies.

	Improvement Strategy	Timeline	Resource
1.	The Special Education Division will collaborate with the OPI's curriculum specialists to provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding intervention strategies.	Ongoing	OPI staff CSPD
2.	Provide technical assistance to schools in collaboration with the Division of Indian Education for All on instructional strategies in general education that may lead to fewer American Indian students identified as needing special education.	Ongoing	OPI staff CSPD
3.	The OPI will provide comprehensive training to selected LEAs regarding the use of Response to Intervention (RtI).	Ongoing	OPI staff CSPD Consultants University of Montana

### Performance Target (2009-2010 School Year)

State Performance Indicator 10 is a compliance indicator. This means that the state performance target established for the 2009-2010 school year will be **0 percent** of the districts in the state will be identified as having disproportionate representation in specific racial and ethnic groups due to inappropriate identification procedures. State performance on this target will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2011.

## CSPD Region Demographics – APPENDIX A

### CSPD REGION I-PESA DEMOGRAPHICS

Within the CSPD Region I-PESA boundary, there are:


- 17 counties
- 90 school districts
- 7 special education cooperatives, of which 70 schools are participating members

The 2008-2009 special education child count:

- Ages 6 through 21: 1,738 students
- Ages 3 through 5: 204 students
- Total special education population: 1,942 students

Figure 1A.1 below provides a picture of student demographics for the region by disability category for students with disabilities, ages 3-21.

**Figure 1A.1 CSPD Region I-PESA Student Disability Demographics**




For the 2008-2009 school year:

- 73.3 percent of the students served in special education are identified as either students with a learning disability (47.3%) or students with speech-language impairments (26.0%) as their dominant disability.

Figure 1A.2 below shows the racial and ethnic make-up of the region, based on the special education child count.

**Figure 1A.2 CSPD Region I-PESA Race/Ethnicity Demographics**



For the 2008-2009 school year:

- **96.4 percent** of the students with disabilities in CSPD Region I-PESA are White, Non-Hispanic and American Indian/Alaskan Native.

## **CSPD REGION II-MNCESR DEMOGRAPHICS**

Within the CSPD Region II-MNCESR boundary, there are:


- Nine counties
- 79 school districts
- the Montana School for the Deaf and Blind
- 4 special education cooperatives, of which 72 schools are participating members

The 2008-2009 special education child count for CSPD Region II-MNCESR is as follows:

- Ages 6 through 21: 2,447 students
- Ages 3 through 5: 401 students
- Total special education population: 2,848 students

Figure 2A.1 below provides a picture of student demographics for the region by disability category.

**Figure 2A. 1 CSPD Region II-MNCESR Student Disability Demographics**




For the 2008-2009 school year:

- **73.9 percent** of the students served in special education are identified as either students with a learning disability (41.86%) or students with speech-language impairments (32.3%) as their dominant disability.

Figure 2A.2 below shows the racial and ethnic make-up of the region, based on the special education child count.

**Figure 2A.2 CSPD Region II-MNCESR Race/Ethnicity Demographics**



The racial/ethnicity demographics for the 2008-2009 school year indicate the following:

- Of the 2,848 students with disabilities, 96.2 percent are White, non-Hispanics (65.4%) or American Indian/Alaskan Native (30.9%). The other three racial/ethnic categories make up the remaining 3.8 percent of the population of students with disabilities within this region.

### **CSPD REGION III-SMART DEMOGRAPHICS**

Within the CSPD Region III-SMART boundary, there are:


- 11 counties
- 84 public school districts
- One Residential Treatment Facility
- 4 special education cooperatives, of which 77 schools are participating members

The 2007-2008 special education child count is as follows:

- Ages 6 through 21: 3,414 students
- Ages 3 through 5: 402 students
- Total special education population: 3,816 students

Figure 3A.1 below provides a picture of student demographics for the region by disability category.

**Figure 3A.1 CSPD Region III-SMART Student Disability Demographics**




The 2008-2009 special education child count indicates the following:

- The schools in CSPD Region III-SMART serve 3,816 students with disabilities.
- 76.0 percent of the students are identified as either students with a learning disability (46.6%), students with speech-language impairments (18.8%), or students with other health impairments (10.5%) as their dominant disability.

Figure 3A.2 below provides a picture of the racial/ethnic make-up of the students with disabilities population, based on the special education child count.

**Figure 3A.2 CSPD Region III-SMART Race/Ethnicity Demographics**



The racial/ethnic demographics for the 2008-2009 school year indicate the following:

- Of the 3,816 students with disabilities, 92.3 percent are White, non-Hispanics (78.2%) or American Indian/Alaskan Native (14.0%). The other three racial/ethnic categories make up the remaining 7.7 percent of the population of students with disabilities within this region.

**CSPD REGION IV-RESA4U DEMOGRAPHICS**

Within the CSPD Region IV-RESA4U boundary, there are:


- 12 counties
- 85 public school districts
- Three Residential Treatment facilities
- One State Institutional facility
- One Youth Correctional facility
- Five special education cooperatives, of which 72 schools are participating members

The 2008-2009 special education child count for CSPD Region IV-RESA4U is as follows:

- Ages 6 through 21: 3,532 students
- Ages 3 through 5: 426 students
- Total special education population: 3,958 students

Figure 4A.1 below provides a picture of student demographics for the region by disability category.

**Figure 4A. 1 CSPD Region IV-RESA4U Student Disability Demographics**




The 2008-2009 special education child count indicates the following:

- 81.9 percent of the students are identified as either students with a learning disability (38.7%), students with speech-language impairments (24.6%), students with other health impairments (10.3%), or students with emotional disturbance (8.3%) as their dominant disability.

Figure 4A.2 below provides a picture of the racial/ethnic make-up of the students with disabilities population, based on the special education child count.

**Figure 4A.2 CSPD Region IV-RESA4U Race/Ethnicity Demographics**



The CSPD Region IV-RESA4U racial/ethnicity demographics for the 2008-2009 school year indicate the following:

- Of the 3,958 students with disabilities, 97.6 percent are White, non-Hispanics (89.8%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (4.5%), or Hispanic or Latino (3.3%). The other two racial/ethnic categories make up the remaining 2.4 percent of the population of students with disabilities within this region.

**CSPD REGION V-WM-CSPD DEMOGRAPHICS**

Within the CSPD Region V-WM-CSPD boundary, there are:


- Seven counties
- 80 public school districts
- Four special education cooperatives, of which 47 schools are participating members

The 2008-2009 special education child count is as follows:

- Ages 6 through 21: 4,541 students
- Ages 3 through 5: 518 students
- Total special education population: 5,059 students

Figure 5A.1 below provides a picture of student demographics for the region by disability category.

**Figure 5A. 1 CSPD Region V-WM-CSPD Student Disability Demographics**




The 2008-2009 special education child count indicates the following:

- 76.6 percent of the students served in special education in this region are identified as either students with a learning disability (40.3%), students with speech-language impairments (25.5%), or students with other health impairments (10.9%) as their dominant disability.

Figure 5A.2 below provides a picture of the racial/ethnic make-up of the students with disabilities population, based on the special education child count.

**Figure 5A.2 CSPD Region V-WM-CSPD Race/Ethnicity Demographics**



The CSPD Region V-WM-CSPD racial/ethnicity demographics for the 2008-2009 school year indicate the following:

- Of the 5,059 students with disabilities, **96 percent** are White, non-Hispanics (86.2%) or American Indian/Alaskan Native (9.8%). The other three racial/ethnic categories make up the remaining 4 percent of the population of students with disabilities within this region.

## **Compliance Monitoring List - APPENDIX B**

### **2008-2009 School Year**

**Bear Paw Cooperative Schools** - Bear Paw Elementary, Big Sandy, Box Elder, Chester-J-I, Chinook, Cleveland, Cottonwood, Davey, Dodson, Gildford Colony, Harlem, Hays-Lodge Pole, Hinsdale, Landusky, Liberty, North Harlem Colony, North Star, Rocky Boy, Saco, Turner, Warrick, Whitewater, Whitlash, Zurich

**Belgrade**

**Bozeman**

**Columbia Falls** - West Glacier

**Department of Corrections – Youth** - Pine Hills School, Riverside Youth Correctional Facility

**Intermountain Children’s Home**

**Kids Behavioral Health**

**Lodge Grass**

**Manhattan** - Three Forks

**Missoula** – Seeley-Swan High School

**Pine Hills Youth Correctional Facility**

**Poplar**

**Riverside Youth Correctional Facility**

**Shodair Children’s Hospital**

**Stillwater/Sweet Grass Cooperative** - Absarokee, Big Timber, Columbus, Fishtail, Greycliff, McLeod, Melville, Nye, Park City, Rapelje, Reedpoint, Sweet Grass County High School

**Target Range Elementary**

**Troy** - McCormick, Sylvanite, Yaak

### **2009-2010 School Year**

**Big Sky SE Cooperative Schools** - Auchard Creek, Augusta, Bynum, Choteau, Conrad, Cut Bank, Dupuyer, Dutton, Fairfield, Galata, Golden Ridge, Greenfield, Miami, Mountain View, Pendroy, Power, Shelby, Sunburst, Valier

**Colstrip**

**Eastern Yellowstone Cooperative Schools** - Custer, Huntley Project, Hysham, Lockwood, Pioneer, Shepherd, Spring Creek

**Evergreen Cooperative Schools** - Bigfork, Helena Flats

**Flathead County Cooperative Schools** - Cayuse Prairie, Creston, Deer Park, Fair-Mont-Egan, Fortine, Kila, Marion, Olney-Bissel, Smith Valley, Somers, Swan Lake-Salmon, Swan River, Trego, West Valley

**Frenchtown**

**Glasgow** - Nashua

**Glendive**

**Havre**

**Helena**

**Kalispell**

**Malta**

**Missoula Area Cooperative** - Alberton, Arlee, Bonner, Charlo, Clinton, DeSmet, Dixon, Lolo, Potomac, Seeley Lake Elementary, St. Ignatius, Sunset, Superior, Swan Valley, Woodman

**Montana School for the Deaf and Blind**

**Park County Cooperative** - Arrowhead, Cooke City, Gardiner, Livingston, Pine Creek,  
Shields Valley

**Wyola**

**Yellowstone Academy Elementary**