

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Nevada



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

In Nevada's FFY2018 SPP/APR, the Nevada Department of Education reports on the extent to which the state met its targets for 16 indicators in 19 local education agencies (LEAs) related to the performance of students with disabilities and the LEAs' level of compliance with IDEA and the Nevada Administrative Code.

The FFY2018 SPP/APR reports performance data for Indicator 1 (regular diploma graduation rate), Indicator 2 (dropout rate), Indicator 3 (participation and performance in statewide assessments), Indicator 4 (suspension/expulsion rate), Indicator 5 (placement for students ages 6-21), Indicator 6 (placement for students ages 3-5), Indicator 7 (preschool outcomes), Indicator 8 (parent involvement), Indicator 14 (post-school outcomes), Indicator 15 (resolution session success rate), and Indicator 16 (mediation success rate). Compliance data are reported for Indicator 4B (suspension/expulsion rates that are the result of noncompliance), Indicator 9 (disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification), Indicator 10 (disproportionate representation within disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification), Indicator 11 (initial evaluation timeline), Indicator 12 (IEP by third birthday for Part C transfer students), and Indicator 13 (secondary transition IEP requirements).

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

19

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

GENERAL SUPERVISION SYSTEM

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) Office of Inclusive Education is committed to ensuring that all exiting students in Nevada are college- and career-ready. To accomplish this, the Office of Inclusive Education through its Director, Supervisor and seven Education Program Professionals strives to build and improve on collaborative efforts with state partners and education stakeholders statewide. It is the NDE's goal to promote educational success for Nevada's students through increased academic rigor; use of evidenced-based practices; providing sustained professional development for administrators, teachers, and staff; providing technical assistance in data-based decision making; and building meaningful partnerships with districts, schools, and parents. The Office of Inclusive Education website is located at http://www.doe.nv.gov/Inclusive_Education/. The website provides access to numerous resources and reports, each designed to provide information and technical assistance to LEAs, parents, critical partners, and other stakeholders in the community.

Following is a description of the NDE's systems for:

- Monitoring
- Data Management and Reporting
- Fiscal Management
- Dispute Resolution
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

MONITORING SYSTEM

Nevada's monitoring system is described below.

The NDE conducts policy/procedure/form review for procedural compliance. The NDE conducts a comprehensive record review in each of the 19 LEAs in the state (17 school districts, the state charter school authority, and the achievement district) at least once every four years. A 91-item checklist is used to monitor each student record selected for monitoring.

Nevada implements a 100% compliance criterion. Noncompliance findings are corrected within one year of identification. In FFY2018 the NDE did not make any prefindings of noncompliance that were corrected before the state issued a finding.

A stratified sampling is used to ensure a representative group of LEAs in each of the four years of the cycle. The 17 school districts have been assigned status as either "urban" (4 districts), "medium rural" (5 districts), or "small rural" (8 districts) depending on the relative size of the LEA and the relative urbanicity of the county seat. The state charter school authority, which includes charter schools statewide, has been assigned status as a "medium" LEA. The achievement district, which includes two charter schools, has been assigned status as a "small" district. In each of the four years in the monitoring cycle, the LEAs selected for monitoring include one "urban" LEA, one "medium rural" LEA, and two "small rural" LEAs. Because there are 6 LEAs in the "medium/medium rural" subgroup, there are two years in the four-year cycle that include 2 of these LEAs. Because there are 9 LEAs in the "small/small rural" subgroup, there is one year in the four-cycle that includes 2 of these LEAs, and two years in the four-year-cycle that include 3 of these LEAs. (Note: This monitoring approach was approved by OSEP in April 2008 as part of the Indicator 8 sampling description. See pp. 33-35 in the February 2010 SPP.)

All schools in the LEA have records selected for review (except Washoe County School District [WCSD] and Clark County School District [CCSD] where size dictates selection); in WCSD and CCSD, schools are selected to ensure a representative sample among elementary, middle, and high schools. Record selection is stratified to ensure representation among race/ethnicity, disability, and placement categories in proportion to the LEA's total child count.

A Corrective Action Plan (CAP) is required to address noncompliance found through review of records and policies/procedures/forms. CAPs are designed collaboratively between LEAs and the NDE. CAPs include procedures for review and revision, if necessary, of policies and procedures, and the provision of training to ensure that systemic noncompliance is corrected within one year. LEAs submit verification that CAP activities have been implemented as approved, and provide record review documentation to demonstrate correction of individual and systemic noncompliance within one year.

DATA MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING

The NDE annually collects data from 19 LEAs. Child count and placement data are collected electronically on October 1, and software tools are used to search for duplicates, perform error checks, and prepare data for submission to EDFacts. The data are uploaded to a central NDE database, where the data are formatted for reports by the EDEN Coordinator for timely submissions. Assessment data are prepared by the NDE and formatted for reports by the EDEN Coordinator for timely submissions to EDFacts. Electronic submissions are provided by LEAs for exiting, discipline, personnel, dispute resolution, and MOE/CEIS data; the data are cleaned and prepared for submission to EDFacts or to EMAPS.

FISCAL MANAGEMENT

The NDE implements the following steps to ensure proper fiscal management in accordance with federal law.

The NDE annually submits SEA eligibility documents to OSEP, including required assurances, descriptions of use of funds, and documentation of public participation. These materials are posted on the NDE website as required through the application development and finalization process.

The LEAs annually submit LEA eligibility documents to the NDE, including required assurances, budgets for anticipated use of funds, excess cost calculations (maintained at local level), data regarding the voluntary use of federal funds for CEIS and data describing LEA compliance with the requirements for proportionate share funding to private school students.

The NDE performs annual calculations of LEA subgrant base amounts and population and poverty allocations as part of entitlement funding. The NDE ensures annual distribution of LEA subgrant awards.

The NDE conducts analyses of identification, placement, and discipline data to identify significant disproportionality. Annual reviews/audits are conducted of LEA subgrant award calculation, distribution, expenditures, maintenance of effort, including the requirements of the Single Audit Act. Funds are timely liquidated at state and local levels.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The NDE ensures establishment, maintenance and ongoing evaluation of the due process hearing system, including: adherence to timelines established in the IDEA; data demonstrating the extent to which resolution sessions result in written settlement agreements; technical assistance material available to the public on the NDE website; training offered to LEAs, parents, advocates, and others regarding NDE's due process hearing procedures; ongoing training of hearing and review officers (specific guidance is given for requiring correction of noncompliance within one year). Ongoing system technical assistance and evaluation is provided by an independent contractor, including evaluation surveys from system users.

The NDE ensures establishment, maintenance, and evaluation of a state mediation system, including collecting evaluation surveys from system users, and analyzing data regarding mediation agreements. Periodic training of mediators is provided regarding IDEA and Nevada law, and mediation techniques.

The NDE ensures establishment, maintenance, and evaluation of a state complaint investigation system, including evaluation of timeliness. NDE analyzes findings to identify LEA training and technical assistance needs.

POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

The NDE's policies and procedures are established primarily in the Nevada Administrative Code, available on the NDE website. Effective implementation of the NAC and IDEA is ensured through the general supervision system, in particular the monitoring and dispute resolution systems. Also, LEAs provide annual assurances regarding policies, procedures, and implementation of IDEA and NAC requirements.

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Technical Assistance System

The NDE implements a comprehensive TA system that maximizes opportunities for face-to-face interactions and leverages technology to sustain the delivery of ongoing technical assistance and support. Intentional engagement occurs with special education leaders as well as with other district leaders who have a role to play in the performance of students with disabilities including superintendents, as well as directors of assessment/accountability, curriculum and instruction, career and technical education, and information technology.

Bi-monthly, NDE leaders plan agendas, coordinate learning opportunities, and facilitate meetings that are routinely attended by the special education directors from each Nevada LEA. These meetings are designed to engage district leaders in learning about evidence-based practices for results (e.g., multi-tiered systems of support, formative assessment practices, universal design for learning, and others) as well as requirements for general supervision (e.g., fiscal issues, grant planning and administration, monitoring and compliance indicators, and so forth). In between these meetings calls are routinely held and emails are exchanged, among NDE and LEA personnel to address individualized TA needs.

Monthly meetings are held with the superintendents from each LEA and attended by the State Superintendent and the Deputy Superintendent for Student Achievement. At these meetings, dialogue occurs regarding student performance, including practices that the state and districts are implementing to support improved results in their schools. The performance of students with disabilities, and the evidence-based practices that LEAs are employing with regard to instruction, assessment, accountability, identification, and educator expectations and support are focused subjects of conversation during several meetings across the year. Meetings are also regularly scheduled to occur quarterly and in some cases, semi-annually, among district leaders across various programs such as assessment, accountability, curriculum and instruction, career and technical education, special education, Title I, and Title III. Issues associated with results for special education students are addressed in these meetings, often as part of the LEAs' larger efforts to close achievement gaps for low-performing students.

The Department also employs routine systems of information dissemination. The State Special Education Director transmits memos and email correspondence as needed to share information about legal requirements and best practices, including guiding LEA personnel to engage in webinars offered by the OSEP TA&D Network. State special education leaders are also engaged in cross-team efforts to build and sustain statewide systems that promote the implementation of evidence-based practices as part of the state's comprehensive approach to school and district improvement, under the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) and the aligned expectations of Nevada's ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Finally, the state utilizes meetings of the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) as part of the TA system. The SEAC meets quarterly, and meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing of information, exchange of ideas, and to make requests of SEAC members to communicate with and share perspectives of the constituencies whom they represent.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

Nevada maintains a comprehensive scheme of licensure, established by state law, designed to prepare teachers to meet the unique needs of students with various disabilities. See <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/NAC/NAC-391.html> for licenses and endorsements for teaching exceptional pupils.

The Nevada State Board of Education has adopted regulations that set forth the expectations which teachers and administrators are required to meet under the Nevada Educator Performance Framework (NEPF). Teachers are expected to: Connect the prior learning and experience of students to guide (1) current learning; (2) assign tasks based upon the appropriate cognitive demands for students with diverse abilities; (3) require students to engage in learning through discourse and other strategies; (4) require students to engage in metacognitive activity; and (5) integrate assessment into instruction.

In order to support effective teaching and learning that results in positive student performance, school administrators are expected to create and sustain: (1) a focus on learning at the school; (2) a school culture of striving for continuous improvement; (3) productive relationships; and (4) structures to support an effective school.

For both teachers and administrators, robust sets of indicators specify the measurable behaviors that exemplify these standards in practice. Significant resources have been invested to ensure that all teachers have the skills and knowledge to provide instruction, and all administrators have the instructional leadership capacity aligned to these standards and indicators, to create teaching and learning parameters that result in high achievement for all students. The states' system of Regional Professional Development Programs — a regional configuration of training entities — has been charged with providing opportunities for educators to learn the standards themselves, and to deepen their capacity to engage in practices that exemplify these standards. Trainings are provided at the school, district, regional, and statewide level, in partnership with LEAs. An aligned system of observation and other data collection mechanisms is in place to check for educator understanding and mastery of content. Systems of educator preparation and teacher and administrator licensure are being aligned to the standards to ensure that coherence across the state's systems of personnel development, accreditation, and professional development.

Additionally, at the systems level, the NDE annually hosts the Mega Conference, a statewide conference that draws hundreds of educators to gather for 2½ days of learning about long-standing practices as well as emerging strategies for successful teaching and learning. Every year, explicit attention is paid to ensuring that evidence-based practices associated with teaching and learning for students with disabilities are substantially represented during the conference. NDE staff members also collaborate with the Nevada Association of School Administrators to provide training during functions offered across the state, three times per year.

Specifically targeted for special education leaders, the NDE also coordinates a three-day workshop each summer, where experts present on practices associated with standards, assessment, accountability, instruction, and educator development.

Special education directors and their senior staff members listen, learn, exchange ideas, and deepen professional connections. They engage in action planning to develop strategies for implementing evidence-based practices in their home districts, which are then revisited in conversations with NDE staff across the year informally, and during specified opportunities in the bi-monthly meetings described under the state's TA approach, described above.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

As of April 27, 2020, NDE has reported to the public, compliant with ADA accessibility standards, on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR at the following website: http://www.doe.nv.gov/Inclusive_Education/SE_Annual_Performance_Reports/. Copies of the reports were previously available by contacting the Nevada Department of Education directly.

Nevada's current State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APP) is available on the NDE website at:

http://www.doe.nv.gov/Inclusive_Education/SPP_and_APR/. This webpage contains a link to the Part B State SPP/APR Data Displays contained on GRADS360. When a member of the public clicks on the Nevada state icon, the most current version of the SPP/APR and related documents are available in .pdf format.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

RESPONSE TO NEEDS ASSISTANCE DETERMINATION IN FFY2017

In June 2018, for FFY2016, NDE's Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Percentage was 75%. In June 2019, for FFY2017, the RDA Percentage was 79.17%, just 0.83% short of the 80% needed to meet requirements. OSEP strongly encouraged the NDE to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which the state received a score of zero. There were four areas where the state received a score of zero: (1) percentage of 8th grade children with disabilities scoring at basic or above on the NAEP reading assessment; (2) percentage of 4th grade children with disabilities scoring at basic or above on the NAEP math assessment; (3) complete data reported for the exiting report; and (4) complete data reported for the state assessments report.

COMPLETENESS OF DATA

To address the completeness of data reported for exiting and state assessments reports, the NDE received assistance from the Center for Integration of IDEA Data (CIID) and IDEA Data Center (IDC).

The NDE took the following actions as a result of that technical assistance. To complete the Exiting file the NDE worked with CIID and IDC to address logic errors in the Generate program to reference NV SSS IDEA and accurately report the Reached Maximum Age category. In preparation for the 2019 file submission, the NDE continued to work with CIID and IDC to ensure accuracy of the Generate logic as well as developed guidance and provided additional technical assistance to LEAs. To complete the Assessment file, the NDE corrected the EMAPS assessment metadata to indicate accurate grade/assessment type/performance level combinations and resubmitted the file. In preparation for the 2019 submission, the NDE ensured the EMAPS assessment metadata was accurate and worked with CIID to run the assessment files through Generate. Other technical assistance activities discussed below also supported the NDE's work to improve the timeliness and accuracy of Nevada's 618 data.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS

To address the performance of students on academic assessments in general, the NDE received assistance from a number of technical assistance centers. This work builds on the work reported in Nevada's FFY2017 SPP/APR. Also, much of this technical assistance also supports improving the quality of student-level data, and the timeliness and accuracy of reporting that data. Work supported by each TA center is discussed separately below.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)

Language and Literacy Cross-State Learning Collaborative (L&L) of NCSI

The NDE took the following actions as a result of technical assistance from NCSI and L&L. In June of 2019, NDE began work with NCSI to review and assess NDE's general supervision system. The work began with Sara Doutré and Jennifer Pierce (WestED-NCSI) facilitating a self-evaluation with the NDE team. Following the initial meeting, NDE staff met with NCSI on bi-weekly phone calls to review self-assessment information, as well as NDE resources to identify inefficient processes or gaps in the system that could be revised. Through this work NCSI has helped NDE make recommendations for change affecting:

- the technology that supports NDE's data collection system
- support to LEAs in providing timely and accurate data submissions
- LEA knowledge and understanding of NAEP and NV SBAC performance data
- presentation format and data presented to LEAs on annual determinations to promote more transparency and support decision-making at the LEA level
- how special education exit information is recorded to capture accurate dropout and graduation rates

This work has been accomplished through participation in the following NCSI and L&L activities and events:

- June 2019, Minneapolis, MN, Spring Leads Meeting
- Quarterly Deep Dive Webinars on topics such as data collection, literacy instruction and family engagement
- Monthly calls with Jennifer Pierce to review implementation practices (SSIP) and literacy work
- June 2019 NCSI-facilitated self-evaluation of NDE's general supervision system
- Bi-weekly telephone calls with Sara Doutré and Jennifer Pierce to discuss and implement changes in general supervision system

National Technical Assistance Center On Transition (NTACT)

Since early 2019, NTACT representatives have supported NDE's efforts to build its capacity toward sustaining and expanding cross-agency collaboration efforts as the technical assistance NTACT has been providing phases out. This work has included:

- supporting the creation of Transition Leadership Teams comprised of representatives from the NDE, LEAs, Vocational Rehabilitation, Nevada Aging and Disability Services, and Nevada PEP (Nevada's federally funded parent training and information center)
- participating in cross-agency collaborative meetings
- providing connections to other states for resource sharing/capacity building (e.g., opportunity to learn from Oregon's use of cross-agency eligibility forms)

Nevada has effectively used NACT's support to build internal capacity and self-sustaining processes toward improving postsecondary outcomes for students with disabilities.

Ohio State University's Nisonger Center

The NDE was sub-awarded funds from the Nisonger Center's OSEP Programs Grant to work toward a statewide implementation of the "envision IT" curriculum. NDE representatives co-trained cohorts of LEA representatives from 9 of Nevada's school districts, as well as representatives from 5 of Nevada's state public charter schools. NDE representatives are holding regular meetings with LEA representatives to providing ongoing support and to monitor LEA implementation efforts.

Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA)
IDEA Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy)

During the 2019-20 school year, the NDE has continued to build on the technical assistance received from ECTA. The NDE produced and disseminated a tool to assist with the quality of the Indicator 7 data collection ("Outcomes Decision Tree").

Nevada continues to work with DaSy to explore options related to improving practices related to data quality, including offering professional development around the processes of collecting and reporting data.

INDICATOR 17 DATA AND PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE SSIP
Indicator 17 SiMR data and a report of progress in implementing the SSIP will be submitted by April 1, 2020.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	23.50%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	77.14%	83.76%	90.37%	97.00%	100.00%
Data	26.43%	27.56%	28.97%	29.29%	64.73%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	100.00%	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders acknowledged that the targets, even though high, must be the same as the targets for graduation with a regular diploma established for all students in the Title I ESEA waiver. Because these targets are the same as the AMO targets for graduation with a regular diploma in the ESEA waiver, the stakeholders supported these targets.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	2,556
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	3,875
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	65.96%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,556	3,875	64.73%	100.00%	65.96%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Receipt of a regular diploma in Nevada during 2017-2018 required a student to (1) earn a minimum of 22.5 credits, (2) participate in End of Course examinations, and (3) participate in a College and Career Ready Assessment. No difference existed between the conditions required of a youth with an IEP and a youth without to earn a regular diploma in Nevada.

For the graduating class of 2017-2018, Nevada used a 4-year "adjusted cohort graduation rate" (ACGR) to calculate high-school graduation rates for the total student population. In the formula, the number of cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma (standard, advanced, and adult diplomas) were divided by the number of youth eligible to graduate. The number of youth eligible to graduate is calculated as the number of first-time 9th graders in fall of a given year (starting cohort) including students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die during that school year and the next three school years, through the summer of the fourth year.

The same formula is used to calculate the the 4-year ACGR for students with IEPs. The calculation of the state's IEP adjusted cohort rate for the 2017-2018 school year is: The number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma (2,556), divided by the number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate (3,875) x 100 = 65.96%.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2008	5.60%
-----------------	-------------	--------------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%
Data	6.58%	4.71%	4.42%	5.25%	5.28%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	5.00%	5.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter

schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, some stakeholders recommended lowering the target to 4.0% for FFY2013-2018, based on the actual data for FFY2012. After analyzing the actual data for FFY2013 showing the dropout rate had increased to 6.58%, and gathering further input from the SEDA stakeholder group, the NDE elected to continue to lower the target each year by 0.1% from FFY2013 through FFY2018.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,959
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	110
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	98
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	376
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

Total IEP dropouts are determined through the student's withdrawal code and their program participation status. Total IEP enrollment is the sum of students eligible for and receiving services under an IEP. In a given year, the formula is expressed as the number of total IEP dropouts divided by the total IEP enrollment, multiplied by 100.

The IEP dropout calculation for 2017-2018 students was calculated as follows: Total IEP Dropouts (632) divided by Total IEP Enrollment (14,321) x 100 = 4.41%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Total IEP Dropouts	Total IEP Enrollment	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
632	14,321	5.28%	5.00%	4.41%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

Dropouts are determined by the student's withdrawal code. The following reasons for withdrawal qualify as a dropout.

- W3(a)i -- Credit deficiency;
- W3(a)ii -- Pregnancy;

W3(a)iii -- Marriage;
W3(a)iv -- Employment;
W3(a)v -- Student has long term medical condition, or in drug treatment or a rehabilitative setting that prevents them from receiving services (NRS 392.050);
W3(a)vi -- Authorization by juvenile division for the district court pursuant to NRS 392.090;
W3(a)vii -- Self-supported or parental support in accordance with NRS 392.100;
W3(a)viii -- Apprenticeship in accordance with NRS 392.110; or
W3(a)ix -- Any other reason not specified in paragraphs 3(a)i through 3(a)viii, inclusive.

W3(b) -- Student withdrawn because age exceeds age restrictions.

W3(c)i -- Permanent expulsion;
W3(c)ii -- Disciplinary or other eligibility reasons; or
W3(c)iii -- Incarceration.

W3(d)i -- Student withdrawn to GED program; or
W3(d)ii -- Student withdrawn to adult vocational/technical program.

W3(e)i -- Absence of the student for 10 consecutive days and whose whereabouts are unknown;
W3(e)ii -- Absence of the student for the entire month with no expected date of return; or
W3(e)iii -- Unexplained absence as set forth in NAC 387.220.

W3(g) -- Attendance excused for distance residence from nearest school (NRS 392.080).

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.30%	Actual	93.70%	96.52%	96.89%	98.13%	97.88%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	97.70%	Actual	93.67%	96.80%	97.36%	98.10%	97.92%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter

schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders acknowledged that the 95% participation rate target is consistent with the participation rate required for all students under the Title I ESEA waiver. Consequently, the stakeholders supported the 95% participate rate target for FFY2013 through FFY2018.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5,100	5,021	5,096	5,040	4,664	4,676			3,436		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,509	4,395	4,446	4,412	4,025	4,024			1,854		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	25	21	21	17	30	33			1,099		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	365	349	366	358	346	353			253		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5,103	5,028	5,093	5,036	4,660	4,668			3,436		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,502	4,399	4,446	4,406	4,052	4,003			1,915		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	22	18	20	14	28	30			1,174		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	366	349	366	357	345	354			252		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	33,033	31,301	97.88%	95.00%	94.76%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	Nevada was 0.24 percentage points short of meeting the 95% participation target. If the data had been rounded up, the target would have been met. The failure to meet this target may have been the result of having inadequate systems and protocols in place to ensure that each student with an IEP participates in statewide assessments. LEAs were directed to review systems and protocols to identify any weaknesses and to take measures to remediate.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	33,024	31,418	97.92%	95.00%	95.14%	Met Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

<http://nevadareportcard.nv.gov/di/main/assessment>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Category A ("Overall") reporting groups should include grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 (data for these grades are reported here in Indicator 3B and in Indicator 3C). Grades 9, 10, 12 and HS should not be included in the reporting group. The NDE discovered that this correction should have been made past the deadline for making the correction in this reporting period. The correction will be made for the FFY2019 SPP/APR.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

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

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	37.00%	38.50%	40.00%	41.50%	43.00%
A	Grade 3	25.70%	Actual	32.34%	72.48%	25.11%	18.29%	17.99%
B	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%
B	Grade 4	25.80%	Actual	30.14%	59.83%	20.52%	16.31%	16.90%
C	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	32.00%	33.50%	35.00%	36.50%	38.00%
C	Grade 5	14.10%	Actual	25.94%	48.80%	17.18%	11.89%	13.05%
D	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%
D	Grade 6	20.20%	Actual	20.95%	56.03%	11.18%	6.58%	8.41%
E	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%
E	Grade 7	17.30%	Actual	19.09%	54.81%	12.88%	7.23%	7.80%

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
F	Grade 8	2005	Target >=	26.50%	27.50%	28.50%	29.50%	30.50%
F	Grade 8	16.00%	Actual	13.19%	52.73%	12.59%	8.13%	7.95%
G	Grade 11	2005	Target >=	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%
G	Grade 11	30.10%	Actual	56.13%	55.78%	38.25%	7.01%	6.15%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%
A	Grade 3	30.50%	Actual	36.01%	34.32%	23.16%	23.96%	23.10%
B	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%
B	Grade 4	30.80%	Actual	36.39%	41.08%	16.60%	15.66%	15.27%
C	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%
C	Grade 5	23.80%	Actual	30.33%	53.13%	13.41%	8.04%	9.68%
D	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	32.00%	33.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%
D	Grade 6	23.00%	Actual	17.82%	52.00%	10.16%	5.82%	6.15%
E	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%
E	Grade 7	17.30%	Actual	17.39%	54.52%	9.94%	5.53%	5.37%
F	Grade 8	2005	Target >=	29.00%	30.50%	32.00%	33.50%	35.00%
F	Grade 8	15.00%	Actual	9.98%	52.44%	8.41%	4.06%	3.31%
G	Grade 11	2005	Target >=	26.00%	27.50%	29.00%	30.50%	32.00%
G	Grade 11	11.60%	Actual	93.26%	94.08%	55.99%	33.25%	3.11%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	44.50%	44.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	39.00%	39.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	39.50%	39.50%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	33.00%	33.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	30.00%	30.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	31.50%	31.50%
Reading	G >=	Grade 11	39.00%	39.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 3	53.00%	53.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	44.00%	44.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	50.00%	50.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	37.00%	37.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	30.00%	30.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	36.50%	36.50%
Math	G >=	Grade 11	33.50%	33.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years

of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders supported continuing incremental increases in the targets for student achievement that aligned to the incremental increases for FFY2005 through FFY2012.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	4,899	4,765	4,833	4,787	4,401	4,410			3,206		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	815	768	612	472	436	354			120		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	5	2	3	6	3			144		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	67	54	9	7	0	0			0		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was	4,890	4,766	4,832	4,777	4,425	4,387			3,341		

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	914	712	440	321	240	174			50		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3	1	2	1	2	1			45		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	157	62	9	14	42	4			38		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	4,899	886	17.99%	44.50%	18.09%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	4,765	827	16.90%	39.00%	17.36%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	4,833	623	13.05%	39.50%	12.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	4,787	482	8.41%	33.00%	10.07%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	4,401	442	7.80%	30.00%	10.04%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	4,410	357	7.95%	31.50%	8.10%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
G	Grade 11	3,206	264	6.15%	39.00%	8.23%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	4,890	1,074	23.10%	53.00%	21.96%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B	Grade 4	4,766	775	15.27%	44.00%	16.26%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	4,832	451	9.68%	50.00%	9.33%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
D	Grade 6	4,777	336	6.15%	37.00%	7.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	4,425	284	5.37%	30.00%	6.42%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	4,387	179	3.31%	36.50%	4.08%	Did Not Meet	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
							Target	
G	Grade 11	3,341	133	3.11%	33.50%	3.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	Nevada continues to experience challenges in its implementation and formative assessment of curriculum aligned to the Common Core State Standards that were adopted in recent years. Training and technical assistance in this area is a priority, and the state's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is focused on key aspects of these challenges facing LEAs.
C	Grade 5	Nevada continues to experience challenges in its implementation and formative assessment of curriculum aligned to the Common Core State Standards that were adopted in recent years. Training and technical assistance in this area is a priority, and the state's State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) is focused on key aspects of these challenges facing LEAs.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	5.90%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous

trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders supported continuing the targets at 0% for FFY2013-2018.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

17

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Nevada compares LEA rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability.

An LEA has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least five percentage points more than the state's average suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (the "statewide bar").

The statewide bar is calculated by dividing the statewide total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days in a school year by the statewide total number of students with disabilities, and adding five percentage points.

Nevada uses a minimum "n" size requirement to exclude LEAs from the calculation if the LEA has fewer than 25 students with disabilities who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year.

LEA rates are calculated by dividing the LEA's total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days by the total number of students with disabilities in the LEA.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Not applicable. The state was not required to complete a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY2018 because 0% of the districts had a significant discrepancy in FFY2017 (using 2017-2018 data) in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

17

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	2	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Nevada compares LEA rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities in each race/ethnic category to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability.

An LEA has a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities, in any race/ethnic category, is at least five percentage points more than the state's average suspension/expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (the "statewide bar"). The statewide bar is calculated by dividing the statewide total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days in a school year by the statewide total number of students with disabilities, and adding five percentage points.

Nevada uses a minimum "n" size requirement to exclude LEAs from the calculation if the LEA has fewer than 25 students with disabilities, in any race/ethnic category, who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year.

LEA rates are calculated by dividing the LEA's total number of students with disabilities, by race/ethnic category, suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days by the total number of students with disabilities in the LEA, by race/ethnic category.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Not applicable. The state was not required to complete a review of policies, procedures, and practices in FFY2018 because 0% of the districts had a significant discrepancy in FFY2017 (using 2017-2018 data) in the rate of suspensions and expulsions by race/ethnicity of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%	63.00%	64.00%
A	63.80%	Data	64.26%	63.83%	63.48%	63.63%	62.27%
B	2005	Target <=	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%
B	15.60%	Data	14.21%	14.45%	14.66%	14.65%	15.34%
C	2005	Target <=	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%	1.60%
C	2.00%	Data	1.47%	1.49%	1.54%	1.47%	1.43%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	64.00%	64.00%
Target B <=	15.00%	15.00%
Target C <=	1.60%	1.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, some stakeholders recommended raising the target for 5-A to 64% for FFY2013-2018, based on the actual data for FFY2012. Other stakeholders recommended more modest increases consistent with the 1% increase per year in previous years. After analyzing the actual data for FFY2005-2012, and considering slippage in other indicators of academic success, the NDE elected to increase the target to 62% for FFY2013 and FFY2014, to 63% for FFY2015 and FFY2016, and to 64% for FFY2017 and FFY2018.

Stakeholders supported maintaining the FFY2012 targets for 5-B and F-C for FFY2013-2018, based on the fact that Nevada's percentages are already lower than the national average, and setting targets too low can compromise IDEA principles related to having a continuum of placements available to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	51,677
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	31,802
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,041
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	606
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	15
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	158

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	31,802	51,677	62.27%	64.00%	61.54%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8,041	51,677	15.34%	15.00%	15.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital	779	51,677	1.43%	1.60%	1.51%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
placements [c1+c2+c3]							

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	23.70%	23.70%	24.70%	24.70%	25.70%
A	23.50%	Data	22.45%	27.04%	30.21%	33.41%	34.07%
B	2011	Target <=	54.30%	54.30%	53.30%	53.30%	52.30%
B	54.60%	Data	61.67%	56.12%	50.53%	47.59%	43.51%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	25.70%	25.70%
Target B <=	52.30%	52.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, stakeholders supported continuing the FFY2012 targets for 6-A and 6-B for FFY2013 and FFY2014, then increasing the target for 6-A by 1% in FFY2015 and FFY2016, and by another 1% in FFY2017 and FFY2018. Stakeholders also supported decreasing the target for 6-B by 1% in FFY2015 and FFY2016 and by another 1% in FFY2017 and FFY2018.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	8,443
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,330
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3,383
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	27
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,330	8,443	34.07%	25.70%	39.44%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,410	8,443	43.51%	52.30%	40.39%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2013	Target >=	76.40%	76.40%	78.50%	78.50%	80.60%

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	78.55%	Data	78.55%	74.03%	78.35%	82.89%	76.66%
A2	2013	Target >=	57.13%	57.13%	58.22%	58.22%	59.31%
A2	57.13%	Data	57.13%	55.00%	56.49%	56.13%	51.73%
B1	2013	Target >=	75.10%	75.10%	77.85%	77.85%	80.60%
B1	77.06%	Data	77.06%	75.18%	78.16%	81.05%	76.60%
B2	2013	Target >=	54.14%	54.14%	55.07%	55.07%	56.00%
B2	54.14%	Data	54.14%	53.94%	54.96%	55.29%	54.19%
C1	2013	Target >=	78.00%	78.00%	79.15%	79.15%	80.30%
C1	72.21%	Data	72.21%	71.22%	66.46%	79.49%	93.63%
C2	2013	Target >=	60.32%	60.32%	62.96%	62.96%	65.60%
C2	60.32%	Data	60.32%	59.73%	53.95%	70.19%	84.27%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	80.60%	80.60%
Target A2 >=	59.31%	59.31%
Target B1 >=	86.60%	86.60%
Target B2 >=	56.00%	56.00%
Target C1 >=	80.30%	80.30%
Target C2 >=	65.60%	65.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

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

Regarding Summary Statement 1 (Targets A1, B1, C1), stakeholders recommended continuing FFY2012 targets in FFY2013, then increasing the targets every two years to reach approximate national averages by FFY2017 and FFY2018.

Regarding Summary Statement 2, stakeholders recommended resetting baselines and lowering targets from the FFY2012 levels to better align Nevada's targets with the national averages. A considerable amount of data was presented to the stakeholder groups to support lowering these targets and resetting baselines. The data and rationale are as follows:

1. The targets set by Nevada for FFY2012 were unreasonably higher than the national average: (PSR) was 17.7% higher than the national average; (KS) was 15.88% higher than the national average; and (AMN) was 14.8% higher than the national average.
2. The actual FFY2012 performance was comparable to the national average: (PSR) was 1.16% under the national average; (KS) was 0.08% under the

national average; and (AMN) was 3.09% under the national average.

3. The actual FFY2013 performance as also comparable to the national average: (PSR) was 2.17% under the national average; (KS) was 1.14% over the national average; and (AMN) was 5.28% under the national average.

The performance for Summary Statement 2 has been very stable for the past two years, suggesting that the data are increasingly valid and reliable. The data that were used prior to the 2009-2010 school year were hand entered into a spreadsheet used to calculate the outcomes and determine improvement strategies. The data collected from those years lacked accuracy, completeness, and reliability. Beginning that year, the NDE invested in a web-based, secure system (Nevada Special Education Accountability and Reporting System -- NVSEARS) to gather and compute the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) data. The system has built-in features that flag any incomplete or non-allowable data, making the data much more accurate and reliable. Additionally, functions have been added to the system to allow for analysis of the data, including a trend analysis function. These features have contributed to stability in the data, but because the data are increasingly reliable, the data now show decreases in performance (which is often the case as data are more accurately reported).

To summarize, Nevada's targets established in FFY2009 were based on baseline data from FFY2008 that were less accurate and reliable than the data collected through NVSEARS. Since that time, the combination of technical assistance and an improved data collection system has provided data that better reflects the state's results. The comparison of our current targets to the national averages also led us to the conclusion that the targets were unreasonably high and that the baseline needed to be reset.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,107

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	52	1.67%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	681	21.92%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	858	27.62%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,054	33.92%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	462	14.87%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,912	2,645	76.66%	80.60%	72.29%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,516	3,107	51.73%	59.31%	48.79%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	43	1.38%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	644	20.73%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	880	28.32%

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,187	38.20%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	353	11.36%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,067	2,754	76.60%	86.60%	75.05%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,540	3,107	54.19%	56.00%	49.57%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	37	1.19%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,080	34.76%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	541	17.41%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	688	22.14%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	761	24.49%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. 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.	1,229	2,346	93.63%	80.30%	52.39%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	1,449	3,107	84.27%	65.60%	46.64%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	The slippage in data appears to be the result of an increase in children falling into the "b" category and a decrease of children reaching the "d" and "e" categories. Of the 3107 students that were assessed, 2358 (75%) are from our state's largest district, Clark County School District (CCSD). During the 2017-18 reporting period, it was reported that CCSD's scores were negatively affected by the algorithm used to automatically generate COS scores. Despite CCSD's ongoing communication and technical assistance with their vendor (Teaching Strategies Gold), they continue to have difficulty with this process. The slippage may also be related to an increase in CCSD in students with

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	more significant disabilities (3% increase in students with Autism and 1% increase in students with Multiple Impairments and Health Impairments). Nevada's State Director of Special Education and 619 Coordinator have met with CCSD to explore alternative methods for the collection and reporting of the COS scores and to improve training for teachers who conduct the assessments.
A2	The slippage in data appears to be the result of an increase in children falling into the "b" category and a decrease of children reaching the "d" and "e" categories. Of the 3107 students that were assessed, 2358 (75%) are from our state's largest district, Clark County School District (CCSD). During the 2017-18 reporting period, it was reported that CCSD's scores were negatively affected by the algorithm used to automatically generate COS scores. Despite CCSD's ongoing communication and technical assistance with their vendor (Teaching Strategies Gold), they continue to have difficulty with this process. The slippage may also be related to an increase in CCSD in students with more significant disabilities (3% increase in students with Autism and 1% increase in students with Multiple Impairments and Health Impairments). Nevada's State Director of Special Education and 619 Coordinator have met with CCSD to explore alternative methods for the collection and reporting of the COS scores and to improve training for teachers who conduct the assessments.
B1	The slippage in data appears to be the result of an increase in children falling into the "b" category and a decrease of children reaching the "d" and "e" categories. Of the 3107 students that were assessed, 2358 (75%) are from our state's largest district, Clark County School District (CCSD). During the 2017-18 reporting period, it was reported that CCSD's scores were negatively affected by the algorithm used to automatically generate COS scores. Despite CCSD's ongoing communication and technical assistance with their vendor (Teaching Strategies Gold), they continue to have difficulty with this process. The slippage may also be related to an increase in CCSD in students with more significant disabilities (3% increase in students with Autism and 1% increase in students with Multiple Impairments and Health Impairments). Nevada's State Director of Special Education and 619 Coordinator have met with CCSD to explore alternative methods for the collection and reporting of the COS scores and to improve training for teachers who conduct the assessments.
B2	The slippage in data appears to be the result of an increase in children falling into the "b" category and a decrease of children reaching the "d" and "e" categories. Of the 3107 students that were assessed, 2358 (75%) are from our state's largest district, Clark County School District (CCSD). During the 2017-18 reporting period, it was reported that CCSD's scores were negatively affected by the algorithm used to automatically generate COS scores. Despite CCSD's ongoing communication and technical assistance with their vendor (Teaching Strategies Gold), they continue to have difficulty with this process. The slippage may also be related to an increase in CCSD in students with more significant disabilities (3% increase in students with Autism and 1% increase in students with Multiple Impairments and Health Impairments). Nevada's State Director of Special Education and 619 Coordinator have met with CCSD to explore alternative methods for the collection and reporting of the COS scores and to improve training for teachers who conduct the assessments.
C1	The slippage in data appears to be the result of an increase in children falling into the "b" category and a decrease of children reaching the "d" and "e" categories. Of the 3107 students that were assessed, 2358 (75%) are from our state's largest district, Clark County School District (CCSD). During the 2017-18 reporting period, it was reported that CCSD's scores were negatively affected by the algorithm used to automatically generate COS scores. Despite CCSD's ongoing communication and technical assistance with their vendor (Teaching Strategies Gold), they continue to have difficulty with this process. The slippage may also be related to an increase in CCSD in students with more significant disabilities (3% increase in students with Autism and 1% increase in students with Multiple Impairments and Health Impairments). Nevada's State Director of Special Education and 619 Coordinator have met with CCSD to explore alternative methods for the collection and reporting of the COS scores and to improve training for teachers who conduct the assessments.
C2	The slippage in data appears to be the result of an increase in children falling into the "b" category and a decrease of children reaching the "d" and "e" categories. Of the 3107 students that were assessed, 2358 (75%) are from our state's largest district, Clark County School District (CCSD). During the 2017-18 reporting period, it was reported that CCSD's scores were negatively affected by the algorithm used to automatically generate COS scores. Despite CCSD's ongoing communication and technical assistance with their vendor (Teaching Strategies Gold), they continue to have difficulty with this process. The slippage may also be related to an increase in CCSD in students with more significant disabilities (3% increase in students with Autism and 1% increase in students with Multiple Impairments and Health Impairments). Nevada's State Director of Special Education and 619 Coordinator have met with CCSD to explore alternative methods for the collection and reporting of the COS scores and to improve training for teachers who conduct the assessments.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The NDE has determined a specific list of state approved assessments from which districts have the option to choose. These assessment options include: AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System); Brigance (IED - II); DAYC (Developmental Assessment of Young Children); Developmental Continuum (Teaching Strategies-Creative Curriculum); and/or Get It-Got It-Go (aligns with DIBELS; must be used with other assessments). Assessments are administered by licensed district service providers (e.g. early childhood special education teachers, speech language pathologists) within one month of entry into district services. Based on the assessment results, a score is established to determine the child's comparability to same-age peers. To compute this score, Nevada has chosen to use the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) developed by the national Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center. A COS score is established for each of three indicator outcome areas. For each of the three areas, a score of 6 or 7 on the COS represents functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers, while a score of 5 or less represents functioning at a level below same-age peers. Once the assessment is complete and the comparability scores are determined based on the COS, data are entered into an established excel spreadsheet with parameters in place to help prevent the entry of misinformation (e.g., a code exists to flag a birth date that is entered which makes the child under age 3 or over age 5). Each district compiles into one database the data for all children served, and submits this information to the NDE through secured internet submission.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
---	----

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders supported continuing 78% as the target for FFY2013-2018.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	71.20%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%	78.00%
Data	75.98%	70.96%	72.83%	77.19%	74.67%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	78.00%	78.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
665	930	74.67%	78.00%	71.51%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

10,469

Percentage of respondent parents

8.88%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During FFY2018, 71.51% of Nevada parents responded in agreement to survey question #25, down from 74.67% the prior year. Because parents in different school districts are surveyed each year (except for Clark and Washoe whose parents are surveyed every year), slight progress or slippage from one year to the next is not considered significant. Although there are year-to-year fluctuations, for the past several years, Nevada's data has remained stable between 70-77%.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The data are collected for children with disabilities in preschool in the same way as the data are collected for school-age children with disabilities. The parents of all students with disabilities for each LEA (except Clark County School District and Washoe County School District) are surveyed in the year that the LEA is selected for on-site monitoring, including the parents of all children with disabilities ages three through five. For Clark and Washoe school districts, the samples are created to be representative of the age, ethnicity, and disability category for the entire population of students with disabilities in those districts, including children with disabilities in preschools.

There are no threats to validity or reliability for the preschool surveys that are any different than for the school-age surveys.

Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Nevada's sampling plan was approved in the submission of the original SPP in December 2005, and it has not changed.

Population Represented

Parents of students with disabilities in Washoe and Clark County School Districts will be sampled to represent the entire population of students with disabilities in those two school districts (i.e., the Washoe sample will represent the entire population of students with disabilities in the Washoe County School District).

Ensuring a Representative Sample

Because the NDE will sample from within each of the two largest school districts (Washoe and Clark) in each year, the sample will be representative of the population it is trying to represent (i.e., parents of students with disabilities in those districts).

Sampling Methods

The sample will be stratified to represent not only each district's population in terms of disability category, but also race/ethnicity and grade group. Because parents will be selected based upon the characteristics of their children (disability category, grade group, and race/ethnicity), the sample is expected to be the same as the population of students with disabilities in the district.

Specific Sampling Procedures

The NDE will use stratified sampling to ensure that a sample representative of the parents of all students with disabilities in the district is surveyed. Stratified sampling is a commonly used probability method that is superior to random sampling, particularly when a subset of the population has low incidence relative to other segments of the population. This method will be useful when sampling among low-incidence disability categories, such as students with vision and hearing impairments. Assistance in assuring a high quality stratified sample will be provided by Piedra Data, a NCSEAM-recommended vendor.

Method/Process for Data Collection

The NCSEAM survey will be used to collect data on the percent of parents who report that their children's schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. The survey will be mailed to families and an Internet version will also be made

available to parents who choose to complete the survey online.

Addressing Problems

Acknowledging that low survey response rates pose problems when drawing inferences about the population as a whole, the NDE will take the following steps to ensure that valid and reliable information is obtained: First, the NDE will work with Piedra Data and Scantron, Inc. to identify the number of responses that are necessary to reasonably draw inferences about the population. In order to ensure sufficient responses, the NDE will over-sample, and then weight responses as necessary.

Assuming that the NCSEAM survey addresses the common flaws in survey question design (unclear questions, providing a postage stamp on the return envelope, etc.), the NDE will work with Nevada PEP (the state's federally funded Parent Training and Information Center) to develop correspondence and other media communications encouraging parents to respond to the survey, and advising parents to seek assistance from Nevada PEP if they are unclear about any aspect of the survey. Incomplete surveys will be followed up with additional mailings.

A Spanish version of the survey will be used as an option for parents, and more than one method (paper and pencil as well as internet) will be available for parent response. Because sampling will only occur in the two largest school districts (Clark and Washoe), no violations of confidentiality are anticipated.

Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

The NDE will work with Piedra Data to analyze the FFY2018 data to identify specific strategies to oversample to increase the responses from race/ethnicity groups that are under-represented in the response group, particularly the Hispanic/Latino and Black/African American groups.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

SURVEY SAMPLE RESPONSE RATE

During FFY2018, parent surveys were disseminated to all students with disabilities in five districts scheduled for a comprehensive monitoring visit (Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, and White Pine). In addition, a sample was selected for parent survey in Clark County School District and Washoe County School district because these districts have an average daily membership (ADM) of more than 50,000 students.

Surveys were successfully sent to 10,469 parents, and a total of 955 responses were received for a 9.1% response rate ($955/10469 = 9.1\%$), exactly the same as in FFY2017. This response rate exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines (e.g., <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>). Of the 955 completed surveys returned, 25 did not complete Item 25, and Item 25 forms the basis for the calculation of Indicator 8. As a result, 930 (955-25) respondents are shown in the calculation of Indicator 8 above. This fact also explains the discrepancy between the 9.1% return rate calculated by NDE, and the 8.88% return rate calculated above by the APR tool.

REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SURVEY RESULTS -- HOW THE DATA REPRESENTS DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE STATE

In order to examine the representativeness of the respondents in the FFY2018 parent survey, student-level data regarding grade level, disability category, and race/ethnicity category are collected for each survey response. Then, the grade level, disability category, and race/ethnicity category data for survey responses are compared to the grade level, disability category, and race/ethnicity category data in the October 1, 2018, child count of students ages 3-21 in the surveyed districts.

REPRESENTATIVENESS BY DISABILITY CATEGORY

The National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) has stated that when representativeness is outside the +/- 3% range, the lack of representativeness is important. When comparing the representativeness within disability categories, Nevada's survey respondents in most categories are within the NPSO acceptable range. See the following data:

- 4% students with intellectual disabilities in the child count, compared to 4% in survey respondents
- 13% students with speech/language impairments in the child count, compared to 14% in survey respondents
- 3% students with emotional disturbance in child count, compared to 3% in survey respondents
- 10% students with developmental delay in child count, compared to 11% in survey respondents
- 14% students with autism in child count, compared to 16% in survey respondents

34% of the responding parents were parents of children with learning disabilities, compared to 43% in child count. This represents a 9-point gap and an increase over the 8-point gap reported in FFY2017.

REPRESENTATIVENESS BY RACE/ETHNICITY CATEGORY

Analysis of the race/ethnicity representativeness showed a very close representativeness (within the +/- 3% range) in categories for American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races. In the other three categories, the analysis showed larger gaps in representativeness.

- 43% students in Hispanic/Latino category in child count, compared to 37% in survey respondents (6-point gap, up from a 4-point gap in FFY2017)
- 15% students in Black/African American category in child count, compared to 5% in survey respondents (10-point gap, same as in FFY2017)
- 30% students in White category in child count, compared to 45% in survey (15-point gap, up from a 13-point gap in FFY2017)

REPRESENTATIVENESS BY GRADE LEVEL

Analysis of the grade category representativeness showed a close representativeness between PreK groups in the child count (8.5%) and respondents in the survey (11%) (down 0.5-points compared to FFY2017), suggesting that preschool parent survey data are representative of the PreK population in these school districts.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

The NDE has responded to this requirement to analyze representativeness above in section "8 Indicator Data," in response to the prompt: "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services."

The NDE has responded to the requirement to report the actions the State is taking to address this issue above in section "8 Indicator Data," in response to the prompt: "If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics."

See these two sections in "8 Indicator Data" above.

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	18	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Nevada defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) weighted risk ratio; (2) with the risk-ratio threshold set at equal to or greater than 3.0; (3) for three consecutive years; (4) with a minimum cell size of 25 (risk numerator).

In FFY2018, one district was totally excluded from the calculation because the district did not meet the minimum cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

In FFY2018, Nevada did not identify any disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

3

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	16	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Nevada defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic/Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or More Races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) weighted risk ratio; (2) with the risk-ratio threshold set at equal to or greater than 3.0; (3) for three consecutive years; (4) with a minimum cell size of 25 (risk numerator).

In FFY2018, three districts were totally excluded from the calculation because the districts did not meet the minimum cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

In FFY2018, Nevada did not identify any disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	76.40%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.30%	95.00%	96.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
23	23	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

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

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

These data are collected as part of annual state monitoring. See "Monitoring" subsection in "General Supervision" section in INTRODUCTION. Each year, each record reviewed is monitored to determine whether the student's initial evaluation was conducted within 45 school days of the date that the student's parent signed the consent for the student's evaluation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY2018, data were collected from five LEAs that were monitored: Elko County School District, Eureka County School District, Humboldt County School District, Lander County School District, and White Pine County School District.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that the State reported that it selected 23 records for whom parental consent to evaluation was received to monitor FFY 2018 compliance with timely initial evaluation requirements. OSEP is concerned that the limited number of records reviewed does not sufficiently represent a "comprehensive record review" or enable the State to "ensure representation among race/ethnicity, disability, and placement categories in proportion to the LEA's total child count" as described in its narrative under "General Supervision System" in the Introduction section of its FFY 2018 IDEA Part B SPP/APR

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	83.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.58%	100.00%	100.00%	97.84%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	49
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	5
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	38
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	5
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	1
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	38	38	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
0

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

These data are collected as part of annual state monitoring. See "Monitoring" subsection in "General Supervision" section in INTRODUCTION. Each LEA selected for monitoring in a given school year submits data for the entire reporting year with necessary elements to complete the calculation required for Indicator 12. Follow-up inquiries are made as needed to clarify any questions that arise during data analyses.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY2018, data were collected from five LEAs that were monitored: Elko County School District, Eureka County School District, Humboldt County School District, Lander County School District, and White Pine County School District.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	92.90%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.30%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6	6	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

These data are collected as part of annual state monitoring. See "Monitoring" subsection in "General Supervision" section in INTRODUCTION. Each year, each record selected for students ages 16 and older is monitored to determine whether each of the required secondary transition components is in place.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
---	----

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY2018, data were collected from five LEAs that were monitored: Elko County School District, Eureka County School District, Humboldt County School District, Lander County School District, and White Pine County School District.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that the State reported that it selected six records of students ages 16 and older to monitor FFY 2018 compliance with secondary transition requirements. OSEP is concerned that the limited number of records reviewed does not sufficiently represent a "comprehensive record review" or enable the State to "ensure representation among race/ethnicity, disability, and placement categories in proportion to the LEA's total child count" as described in its narrative under "General Supervision System" in the Introduction section of its FFY 2018 IDEA Part B SPP/APR.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	28.00%
A	24.00%	Data	21.39%	21.57%	18.47%	18.88%	20.71%
B	2009	Target >=	56.00%	56.00%	56.00%	57.00%	57.00%
B	53.00%	Data	56.05%	56.13%	54.73%	61.29%	57.32%
C	2009	Target >=	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	73.00%	73.00%
C	69.00%	Data	69.77%	69.59%	68.94%	75.05%	71.89%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	28.00%	28.00%
Target B >=	57.00%	57.00%
Target C >=	73.00%	73.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that

had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

During FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders supported continuing the FY2012 targets for the three years from FFY2013 through FFY2015, and then increasing each category (A, B, C) by 1% for the three years from FFY2016 through FFY2018.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,243
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	276
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	443
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	97
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	76

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	276	1,243	20.71%	28.00%	22.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	719	1,243	57.32%	57.00%	57.84%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	892	1,243	71.89%	73.00%	71.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

ANALYSIS OF DATA ON REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SURVEY RESPONSES

DISABILITY CATEGORY

Respondents were compared to the original survey population to determine the representativeness of the responding students when compared to the surveyed students, using the Response Calculator developed by the National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) Center. Representativeness was compared by disability category for students with learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, and intellectual disabilities, with the following results:

- 65% of students surveyed had learning disabilities; 64.5% of respondents had learning disabilities
- 5.8% of students surveyed had emotional disturbance; 5.2% of respondents had emotional disturbance
- 4.3% of students surveyed had intellectual disabilities; 3.1% of respondents had intellectual disabilities

Each of these differences was within the +/- 3% acceptable range identified by NPSO. Improvements were made in the representativeness of students in all three categories, compared to FFY2017 data.

RACE/ETHNIC CATEGORY

Students were also compared for representativeness according to minority (non-White) status, with the following results. 65% of students surveyed were minority students (non-White), and 60% of respondents were minority students. This 5-point difference is not within the acceptable range identified by NPSO.

GENDER AND ELL CATEGORY

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

- 35% of students surveyed were female; 35.7% of respondents were female
- 65% of students surveyed were male; 64.3% of respondents were male

- 18% of students surveyed were English Language Learners; 19% of respondents were English Language Learners

Each of these differences was within the +/- 3% acceptable range identified by NPSO. The results for gender are comparable to the FFY2017 data, but the results for ELL students show an improvement in representativeness.

DROPOUTS

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

9.9% of students surveyed were dropouts; 6.1% of respondents were dropouts (a 3.8-point difference)

The 3.8-point difference represents a significant improvement when compared to the 8-point difference reported in FFY2017.

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	NO
--	----

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Representativeness was stable and within acceptable ranges for all groups except in the minority group and dropout group categories. Significant improvements have been made in response representativeness of the dropout group, but there was a decline to FFY2016 levels in response representativeness of the minority group. In FFY2019, NDE will be working with a new vendor, and strategies to address under-representation in these two particular groups will be specifically addressed.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The overall survey response rate increased from 37% in FFY2017 to 43% in this year's report, and the response rate increased in every demographic group that was compared for representativeness.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

The NDE has responded to this requirement to analyze representativeness above in section "14 Indicator Data," in response to the prompt: "Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school."

The NDE has responded to the requirement to report the actions the State is taking to address this issue above in section "14 Indicator Data," in response to the prompt: "If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics."

See these two sections in "14 Indicator Data" above.

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those target.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	130
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	96

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders supported continuing the targets at 85%.

SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	91.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	65.17%	80.25%	72.04%	87.00%	80.95%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
96	130	80.95%	85.00%	73.85%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

As discussed in previous Annual Performance Reports, written resolution settlement agreements are not the only means for settling disputes. During 2018-2019, of the 139 total due process hearing requests received, only three went to a hearing. Consequently, Nevada's actual resolution rate was 98%. This overall resolution rate is significant. It suggests that although resolution sessions may not always result in written settlement agreements, various other means are successfully used in Nevada to resolve disputes without due process hearings. If resolution session "success" is declining in any particular year, it means nothing more than that LEAs and parents are using other effective means to resolve disputes, and the NDE does not value one dispute resolution mechanism over another.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	7
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

In FFY2013, when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the state used the following mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets:

Using the GRADS360 templates as an organizing framework, the NDE prepared a document to facilitate target review, including the six previous years of targets and actual data for each of the 16 indicators, along with any data available for FFY2013. The NDE also prepared some analysis of previous trends in both targets and actual data. This document was presented in January 2015 to two organizations representing more than a dozen broad stakeholder groups: the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) and the Special Education District Administrators (SEDA) group.

The SEAC is comprised of 34 members representing individuals with disabilities, parents of students with disabilities, the state's parent training and information center, the state's protection and advocacy group, foster care agencies, special education teachers, higher education institutions, state and local education officials, special education program administrators, other state agencies serving students with disabilities, private schools, public charter schools, adult service agencies, and juvenile and adult corrections agencies. SEAC members represent urban and rural regions of the state. A majority of the members of SEAC are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.

The SEDA group is comprised of the local school district, state public charter school authority, and achievement district special education directors, along with senior-level administrators in the larger school districts.

Stakeholder groups were given copies of the target document for review and response. This information was reviewed with stakeholders who were given an opportunity collectively as well as individually to provide comments and make suggestions specifically focused on targets. During the input sessions, comments and suggestions were collected. All input was carefully reviewed by the NDE and as a result, some revisions were made to the targets that had been proposed by the NDE to the stakeholder groups for their input.

Additional information regarding stakeholder involvement in particular indicators is provided within those indicator sections.

In FFY2013 when the state set its targets for FFY2013 through FFY2018, the stakeholders supported continuing the target at 80% for FFY2013-2018. SEAC and SEDA stakeholder groups recommended that FFY2018 targets be extended without modification to FFY2019.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	80.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data	50.00%	100.00%	80.00%	71.43%	62.50%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	80.00%	80.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7	0	7	62.50%	80.00%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



Nevada Part B SSIP
Phase III-4 REPORT A

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Will Jensen

Title:

Nevada Department of Education, Director, Office of Inclusive Education

Email:

wjensen@doe.nv.gov

Phone:

775-687-9171

Submitted on:

04/30/20 12:15:59 PM

ED Attachments



NV-B Dispute
Resolution 2018-19.pdf



NV-2020DataRubricP
artB.pdf



2020 HTDMD Part
B.pdf



nv-resultsmatrix-2020
b.pdf



NV-apr1tr-2020b.pdf