Nevada State Performance Plan
Annual Performance Report
Elko County School District Performance Indicator Data – 2016-2017 (May 2018)

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 school districts for SPP indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. The table below shows how this school district performed on specific indicators and whether or not the district 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, Part B for 2013-2018 can be found at on the Department of Education website at http://www.doe.nv.gov/SPED_Performance_Plans/.

State Performance Indicator		**2016-2017** State Target	**2016-2017** District Data	Did District Meet State Target?
1.	Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma—district percentage at or **above** state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported using **2015-2016** data).	90.37%	57.89%	**No**
2.	Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school—district percentage at or **below** state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported using **2015-2016** data).	5.3%	*	**Yes**
3.	A. Annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for students with IEPs. If district has minimum "n" size and meets AMO targets, district meets state target.	No longer required	No longer required	**NA**
	B. MATH - Assessment participation rate for students with IEPs.	95%	98%	**Yes**
	READING – Assessment participation rate for students with IEPs.	95%	98%	**Yes**
	C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs.			
	Mathematics – 3rd	51%	18%	**No**
	Mathematics – 4th	42%	*	**No**
	Mathematics – 5th	46%	*	**No**
	Mathematics – 6th	35%	*	**No**
	Mathematics – 7th	28%	*	**No**
	Mathematics – 8th	33.5%	*	**No**
	Mathematics – High School	30.5%	50%	**Yes**
	Reading – 3rd	41.5%	18%	**No**
	Reading – 4th	37%	*	**No**
	Reading – 5th	36.5%	*	**No**
	Reading – 6th	31%	*	**No**
	Reading – 7th	28%	*	**No**
	Reading – 8th	29.5%	*	**No**
	Reading – High School	37%	23%	**No**

***** 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 (Indicator 3C), # IEP students ages 6-21 (Indicator 5), # IEP students ages 3-5 (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).

State Performance Indicator		2016-2017 State Target	2016-2017 District Data	Did District Meet State Target?
4.	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. District percentage at or **below** state target meets state target (this indicator is required to be reported using **2015-2016** data). (NA=district did not meet minimum "n" size)	No significant discrepancy	NA	**NA**
	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, **and** 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 **2015-2016** data). (NA=district did not meet minimum "n" size)	No significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity + noncompliant policies, procedures or practices	NA	**NA**
5.	A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. District percentage at or **above** state target meets state target.	63%	61%	**No**
	B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. District percentage at or **below** state target meets state target.	15%	5%	**Yes**
	C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. District percentage at or **below** state target meets state target.	1.6%	0.2%	**Yes**
6.	A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. District percentage at or **above** state target meets state target.	24.7%	47.1%	**Yes**
	B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. District percentage at or **below** state target meets state target.	53.3%	40%	**Yes**
7.	**Outcome A:** Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)			
	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.	78.5%	82.1%	**Yes**
	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.	58.22%	62.07%	**Yes**
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)			
	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.	77.85%	88.9%	**Yes**
	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.	55.07%	44.83%	**No**
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs			
	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.	79.15%	94.1%	**Yes**
	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.	62.96%	74.14%	**Yes**

State Performance Indicator		2016-2017 State Target	2016-2017 District Data	Did District Meet State Target?
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=district was not surveyed because district was not selected for monitoring during **2016-2017**)	78%	NA	**NA**
9.	Disproportionate representation (DR) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	No DR	No DR	**Yes**
10.	Disproportionate representation (DR) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	No DR	No DR	**Yes**
11.	Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within state-established timeline of 45 school days. (NA=district was not selected for monitoring during **2016-2017**)	100%	NA	**NA**
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= district was not selected for monitoring during **2016-2017**)	100%	NA	**NA**
13.	Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes various required components for transition from secondary school to reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. (NA=district was not selected for monitoring during **2016-2017**)	100%	NA	**NA**
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.	28%	15%	**No**
	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.	57%	70%	**Yes**
	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.	73%	80%	**Yes**

Determination Under IDEA for 2016-2017

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 school district's status in implementing the purposes and requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This annual determination is based upon a review of each district'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.

School districts 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. School districts 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 75-94% 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 Elko County School District determination for **2016-2017** is: **Meets Requirements.**