

# Nevada State Performance Plan Annual Performance Report

## Churchill County School District Performance Indicator Data – 2020-2021 (May 2022)

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004) requires states to develop and submit a State Performance Plan (SPP) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) at the U.S. Department of Education. The SPP is designed to evaluate the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEA and describe how the state will improve its implementation. The plan consists of several priority areas with specific indicators defined for each area. Measurable and rigorous targets are defined for each indicator to show progress throughout the period of the SPP. States are required to report publicly on the performance of local education agencies (LEAs) for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. The table below shows how this LEA performed on specific indicators and whether or not the LEA met the state's annual targets for those indicators as defined in the Nevada State Performance Plan. A link to the Nevada State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report can be found at <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/spp-apr-letters?selected-category=sppapr-part-b&selected-year=&state=Nevada>

<b>State Performance Indicator</b>		<b>2020-2021 State Target</b>	<b>2020-2021 LEA Data</b>	<b>LEA Met State Target?</b>
Unless otherwise noted, an LEA percentage at or <b>above</b> the state target meets the state target.				
<b>1.</b>	Percent of youth with IEPs exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma (this indicator is required to be reported using <b>2019-2020</b> data).	72.72%	62.96%	<b>No</b>
<b>2.</b>	Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out—LEA percentage at or <b>below</b> state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported using <b>2019-2020</b> data).	15.85%	*	<b>No</b>
<b>3.A</b>	Participation rates of students with IEPs in regular and alternate statewide assessments			
	<b>READING</b>			
	Grade 4	95.00%	87.76%	<b>No</b>
	Grade 8	95.00%	85.42%	<b>No</b>
	High School (Grade 11)	95.00%	84.00%	<b>No</b>
	<b>MATHEMATICS</b>			
	Grade 4	95.00%	85.71%	<b>No</b>
	Grade 8	95.00%	87.50%	<b>No</b>
	High School (Grade 11)	95.00%	92.00%	<b>No</b>
<b>3.B</b>	Proficiency rates of students with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards			
	<b>READING</b>			
	Grade 4	18.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	Grade 8	9.00%	*	<b>Yes</b>
	High School (Grade 11)	9.00%	*	<b>Yes</b>
	<b>MATHEMATICS</b>			
	Grade 4	17.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	Grade 8	5.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	High School (Grade 11)	4.00%	*	<b>Yes</b>
<b>3.C</b>	Proficiency rates of students with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards			
	<b>READING</b>			
	Grade 4	16.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	Grade 8	1.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	High School (Grade 11)	1.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	<b>MATHEMATICS</b>			
	Grade 4	18.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	Grade 8	2.00%	*	<b>No</b>
	High School (Grade 11)	16.00%	*	<b>Yes</b>

State Performance Indicator	2020-2021 State Target	2020-2021 LEA Data	LEA Met State Target?
<b>3.D</b> Gap in proficiency rates for students with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards. LEA gap percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.			
<b>READING</b>			
Grade 4	24.50%	17.39%	<b>Yes</b>
Grade 8	33.50%	26.90%	<b>Yes</b>
High School (Grade 11)	38.50%	40.44%	<b>No</b>
<b>MATHEMATICS</b>			
Grade 4	16.50%	20.86%	<b>No</b>
Grade 8	18.50%	11.06%	<b>Yes</b>
High School (Grade 11)	19.50%	6.87%	<b>Yes</b>
<b>4.</b> A. Significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year, when compared to statewide average. LEA percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported using <b>2019-2020</b> data). (NA=LEA did not meet minimum “n” size for significant discrepancy calculations)	No significant discrepancy	NA	<b>NA</b>
B. Significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities, by race or ethnicity, for greater than 10 days in a school year, when compared to statewide average, <u>and</u> policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with IDEA requirements (this indicator is required to be reported using <b>2019-2020</b> data). (NA=LEA did not meet minimum “n” size for significant discrepancy calculations)	No significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity + noncompliant policies, procedures or practices	NA	<b>NA</b>
<b>5.</b> A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.	63.60%	69.57%	<b>Yes</b>
B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. LEA percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	14.01%	3.85%	<b>Yes</b>
C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. LEA percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	1.39%	0.61%	<b>Yes</b>
<b>6.</b> A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.	40.29%	51.22%	<b>Yes</b>
B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. LEA percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	49.19%	19.51%	<b>Yes</b>
C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program receiving special education and related services in the home. LEA percentage at or <u>below</u> state target meets state target.	0.65%	2.44%	<b>No</b>

State Performance Indicator	2020-2021 State Target	2020-2021 LEA Data	LEA Met State Target?
7.	Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved ...		
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>			
1.	Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	68.71%	100.00% <b>Yes</b>
2.	The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	42.56%	32.26% <b>No</b>
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>			
1.	Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	70.74%	100.00% <b>Yes</b>
2.	The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	45.41%	32.26% <b>No</b>
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>			
1.	Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	70.31%	100.00% <b>Yes</b>
2.	The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	41.71%	51.61% <b>Yes</b>
8.	Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (NA=LEA was not surveyed because LEA was not selected for monitoring during 2020-2021)	78.00%	NA <b>NA</b>
9.	Disproportionate representation (DR) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (NA=LEA did not meet minimum "n" size for disproportionate representation calculations)	No DR	No DR <b>Yes</b>
10.	Disproportionate representation (DR) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (NA=LEA did not meet minimum "n" size for disproportionate representation calculations)	No DR	No DR <b>Yes</b>
11.	Percent of children who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 45 school days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation. (NA=LEA was not selected for monitoring during 2020-2021)	100.00%	NA <b>NA</b>
12.	Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (NA=LEA was not selected for monitoring during 2020-2021)	100.00%	NA <b>NA</b>
13.	Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (NA=LEA was not selected for monitoring during 2020-2021)	100.00%	NA <b>NA</b>
14.	A. Percent of youth (who were no longer enrolled in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) who were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	27.00%	* <b>No</b>
	B. Percent of youth (who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) who were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.	63.00%	* <b>Yes</b>
	C. Percent of youth (who were no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school) who were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	74.00%	* <b>No</b>

\* In compliance with FERPA, data not reported for groups totaling fewer than 10 students. Groups include # students earning regular high school diplomas (Indicator 1), # students dropping out of school (Indicator 2), # students proficient on statewide examinations (Indicators 3B, 3C), # IEP students ages 5 enrolled in kindergarten and 6-21 (Indicator 5), # IEP students ages 3, 4, and 5 enrolled in preschool (Indicator 6), # IEP students exiting preschool programs (Indicator 7), # parent survey respondents (Indicator 8), and # IEP students who were no longer enrolled in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school (Indicator 14).

### **Determination Under IDEA for 2020-2021**

In accordance with federal requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) is required to make an annual determination of each LEA's status in implementing the purposes and requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This annual determination is based upon a review of each LEA's data against the state targets established for performance and compliance indicators under the Nevada State Performance Plan. "Performance" indicators include Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 14. "Compliance" indicators include Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 as well as correction of noncompliance identified during the previous year reported under Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

LEAs that were determined to "meet requirements" (a) reported accurate and timely data, (b) demonstrated substantial compliance for Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (as applicable) at a 95-100% rate, and (c) demonstrated correction of noncompliance identified during the previous year at a 95-100% rate. LEAs that were determined to "need assistance" (a) did not report accurate and/or timely data but took action to correct data systems; (b) demonstrated substantial compliance for Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (as applicable) at a 50-94% rate; (c) demonstrated correction of noncompliance identified during the previous year at a 95-100% rate; and (d) met a target for at least one performance indicator.

Based on these criteria, the Churchill County School District determination for **2020-2021** is: **Meets Requirements**