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# 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**

The West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE) is pleased to submit West Virginia's (WV) FFY 2022 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR). This SPP/APR documents and evaluates the state's implementation of special education services as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). WVDE’s Division of Federal Programs and Support, Office of Special Education (WVDE/OSE) is dedicated to continuous improvement in both compliance with IDEA requirements and achieving positive educational and post-school outcomes for students with disabilities statewide. Every initiative, communication, and intervention at the state educational agency (SEA) serves to support this mission. By setting clear targets for each of the 17 SPP/APR indicators, WVDE/OSE creates a framework for assessing progress at all levels, from individual students to broad outcomes.

WVDE/OSE ensures compliance with the provisions and requirements of the IDEA through the implementation of WVBE Policy 2419: Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities [https://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/]. WVDE/OSE is a dedicated partner and resource for diverse stakeholders in providing a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for all students with disabilities, working alongside parents, local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, educators, administrators, and the community to ensure compliance with IDEA. Extensive technical assistance and support is provided statewide to facilitate the implementation of effective practices and continuously improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities.

Data sources include the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS), state monitoring, other state data systems, and documentation provided by LEAs. The WVDE/OSE regularly shares these data and works collaboratively with stakeholder groups to solicit input, gather feedback, analyze progress towards targets, and develop strategies for ongoing improvement.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

The data reported in this APR are primarily from SY 2022-23, reflecting the most recent performance of WV’s special education programs. However, data from SY 2021-22 are reported for Indicators 1, 2, 4A, and 4B due to specific federal requirements associated with these indicators.

Please note that the COVID-19 pandemic is likely to have continuing effects on special education data for SY 2022-23 (FFY 2022). Academic impacts and potential learning loss stemming from prior disruptions to in-person learning may be evident in assessment scores and overall academic performance. Social-emotional challenges faced by students throughout the pandemic are likely to continue influencing data on behavior and discipline. Despite these challenges, educators and policymakers in WV are continually working to meet the evolving needs of SWDs.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

61

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).**

INTEGRATED MONITORING \* FISCAL MANAGEMENT \* SUSTAINING COMPLIANCE AND IMPROVEMENT
— WVDE/OSE ensures ongoing compliance and improvement by monitoring each LEA at least once every four years, with additional reviews when needed. This involves a pre-visit desk audit in which WVDE/OSE reviews selected student files and LEA documents related to special education (e.g., IEPs, finances, staffing, surveys, policies) to gain initial insights, followed by an on-site review, in which WVDE/OSE gathers diverse perspectives and data through interviews, classroom observations, and focus groups with educators, parents, and students. This process assesses instructional practices, student engagement, accessibility, and identifies potential issues or concerns. The SEA then issues a comprehensive report detailing required corrections for any individual and/or systemic findings of noncompliance identified and provides recommendations for best practices to improve the implementation of special education programs.
— In SY 2022-23, WVDE/OSE introduced a more rigorous risk-based fiscal management component to the monitoring procedures. This component uses a matrix to assess various fiscal factors and assign risk levels to each LEA accordingly, potentially triggering more intensive monitoring through additional school visits and file reviews.
— Recognizing the need for stronger transition planning highlighted by the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) work, WVDE/OSE also prioritized high-quality transition assessments, postsecondary goals, and evidence-based practices to improve student outcomes.
— WVDE/OSE monitors corrections implemented within integrated monitoring activities to ensure timely resolution of issues identified at both individual and system levels. Further reviews are conducted to verify that the corrections result in generalized improvements necessary for sustained compliance within each LEA. In cases of persistent systemic noncompliance where sanctions may be necessary, WVDE/OSE prioritizes collaboration with LEAs. By providing clear requirements, feedback, and guidance, WVDE/OSE supports LEAs in developing and following effective implementation plans to achieve compliance. The full monitoring manual may be found here: [https://wvde.us/special-education/policies-and-compliance/monitoring-and-compliance/#fusion-tab-specialeducationmonitoring]

IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
— In SY 2021-22, WVDE/OSE began a thorough review and revision of WVBE Policy 2419, the state's regulatory manual for implementing IDEA. All components of the policy were examined, and extensive feedback was collected from a diverse group of internal and external stakeholders. This collaborative effort ultimately resulted in a finalized policy revision made effective March 2023 that strengthens compliance with IDEA and better addresses the educational needs of all students with disabilities and suspected disabilities. The WVDE/OSE team subsequently conducted statewide training sessions for all LEAs, both onsite and virtually, ensuring a clear understanding and accurate execution of the revised policy content.

DATA \* SPP/APR \* TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
— WVDE/OSE reports annually on the state’s performance using aggregate data collected from LEAs in the SPP/APR. Data sources include the West Virginia Educational Information System (WVEIS), state monitoring, other state data systems, as well as documentation provided by LEAs. Using multiple sources of data WVDE/OSE annually makes LEA determinations which are further described in the state’s system of general supervision [https://wvde.us/special-education/policies-and-compliance/]. In addition to the LEA determinations, WVDE/OSE annually reviews data for SPP/APR indicators for all LEAs as part of an annual desk audit (ADA). When the LEA does not meet targets in one or more focus areas (graduation/postsecondary, assessment, least restrictive environment, pre-K) on the ADA review, WVDE/OSE requires the development of a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable plan that outlines the LEA’s targeted strategy for improving results for students with disabilities (SWD). This plan is known as a Targeted Systemic Improvement Plan (TSIP) and is also a major component of integrated monitoring activities and provision of technical assistance and support to LEAs. While universal support from WVDE/OSE is available to all LEAs, the TSIP ensures that each LEA also receives targeted assistance in a specific area for which they have a demonstrated need. Targeted support is provided by WVDE/OSE through required meetings as a Community of Practice (CoP) related to the focus area selected in the TSIP. Although any LEA may join any CoP session to access targeted technical assistance and professional learning, intensive support is also provided to LEAs requiring further intervention based on their annual determination category. Based upon the LEA determination, some LEAs are required to attend a minimum of four additional support and training opportunities provided by WVDE/OSE and individualized for specific LEA needs. Additionally, the SEA has implemented a tiered system of support for all LEAs further described in the “Technical Assistance System” section below.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION
— To help resolve disagreements about special education issues, WVDE/OSE offers the full range of IDEA-mandated dispute resolution options, enabling parents/guardians, adult students, and LEAs to find mutually acceptable solutions that comply with applicable state and federal laws. For early conflict prevention, WVDE also offers a facilitated IEP team meeting option, which utilizes trained, impartial facilitators to navigate the IEP process and ensure that the input and concerns of all IEP team members are meaningfully considered as the team moves toward consensus. Written, formal state complaints address alleged violations by LEAs, with early resolution possible through voluntary local conferences. Mediation serves as a confidential, non-adversarial option for resolving any IDEA-related disputes, facilitated by a neutral mediator. Due process complaints provide a formal avenue for addressing concerns about student identification, evaluation, placement, or the provision of FAPE. Conducted by impartial hearing officers, these complaints culminate in binding decisions, with appeal rights reserved for state or federal courts. Through this array of dispute resolution options, WVDE empowers both parents/adult students and LEAs to actively participate in resolving special education-related concerns.

GENERAL SUPERVISION MANUAL
— WV’s system of general supervision document is located at https://wvde.us/special-education/policies-and-compliance/. Based on stakeholder input, WVDE/OSE is in the process of updating this document to reflect recent changes to procedures and practices that strengthen the monitoring process, including, but not limited to, a heavier focus on instructional best practices that impact outcomes for students with disabilities, building the capacity of stakeholders to participate fully in the educational process, and a stronger fiscal monitoring component. These updates will also be aligned to the March 2023 revision to Policy 2419 and the release of OSEP QA 23-01, which outlines a state’s general supervision responsibilities under IDEA. This updated general supervision, will include the definition of “areas of concern” and the processes and procedures to be followed when situations occur outside of monitoring activities and dispute resolution procedures.

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

To ensure all LEAs have access to high quality, evidence-based technical assistance (TA) and support, WVDE/OSE has implemented a tiered system of support, encompassing universal, targeted, and intensive levels.

UNIVERSAL TA
This level provides essential information and resources to address common needs and promote program effectiveness. Key supports include:
\* Direct assistance from regional WVDE/OSE coordinators: Each LEA has a primary point of contact for guidance and support.

\* Access to specialized centers: LEAs can connect with SEA-funded TA centers for accessibility and transitions (Accessibility and Transitions Technical Assistance Center at the WV Schools for the Deaf and Blind), behavior/mental health (WV Behavior/Mental Health Technical Assistance Center at Marshall University Campus), autism (WV Autism Training Center at Marshall University Campus), and family engagement (WV Parent Training and Information [WVPTI], and Parent Educator Resource Centers [PERC]).

\* Training and resources: WVDE/OSE offers virtual and face-to-face training options on evidence-based practices, standards-based IEPs, policy components, inclusive practices, student/parent engagement, compliance, dispute resolution, and other special education topics.

\* Networking and collaboration: Annual conferences and mentorship programs sponsored by the WV Council of Administrators of Special Education (WVCASE), statewide monthly support calls, and listserv updates foster connections and knowledge sharing. Additional targeted/intensive mentorship is provided by WVDE/OSE upon request or when a need is identified by the SEA.

\* Online resources: Guidance documents, tip sheets, brochures, practical resources including a weblink resource bank, and free Canvas courses are available on the WVDE/OSE website. Directors receive updates when any new resources become available.

TARGETED TA
This level of TA offers more focused support through two main avenues: quarterly community of practice (CoP) meetings, and dedicated teams for Comprehensive Support & Improvement-Additional Targeted Support Schools (CSI-ATS). CoP sessions provide a platform for participants to share knowledge, experiences, and resources within specific areas of need, while CSI-ATS teams work closely with schools falling short of proficiency goals for students with disabilities. The three-year CSI-ATS project focuses heavily on instructional and inclusive practices and was initiated through a partnership between the WVDE/OSE and WVDE/Office of School Improvement. Utilizing needs assessments, ongoing school visits, and collaborative partnerships, these teams support and guide school improvement efforts with a focus on enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities.

Targeted TA also encompasses a range of activities, including:
\* Phone calls and emails to address student- and LEA-specific situations.

\* Meetings and mentor programs for supporting new special education directors, new special educators, and other targeted groups.

\* Guidance following cyclical monitoring for implementing required corrective actions.

\* Specialized training tailored to areas selected for improvement by the LEA or derived from dispute resolution and monitoring noncompliance with required corrective action.

INTENSIVE TA
For LEAs facing significant challenges, WVDE/OSE provides additional, tailored support beyond Targeted TA. This level involves:

\* Required participation in relevant CoPs to deepen knowledge and expertise in specific areas of need.

\* Regular progress monitoring meetings to collaboratively track the effectiveness of implemented activities within established timelines.

\* Focused monitoring activities to address systemic issues identified within an LEA.

\* Assessing the implementation and outcomes of corrective actions, ensuring compliance and positive student outcomes.

\* Addressing unique challenges or barriers through tailored support for specific LEA needs.

In cases of crisis-level situations across the educational process, the WVDE Office of Accountability conducts special circumstance reviews. When such reviews include concerns within the special education domain, WVDE/OSE participates to assess the situation, provide support, identify noncompliance, and define required corrective actions.

**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 children with disabilities.**

WVDE/OSE recognizes the critical role of professional development (PD) in fostering school improvement and positive outcomes for students with disabilities. Through a collaborative approach involving different divisions within the SEA, WVDE/OSE offers a comprehensive selection of PD opportunities designed to enhance the skills and knowledge of educators and LEA staff serving students with disabilities. PD offerings include:

\* Engaging e-Learning courses providing convenient, in-depth study throughout the year on subjects such as autism, mathematics, support for specially designed instruction (SSDI), positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), co-teaching, West Virginia Tiered System of Support (WVTSS), and accessible educational materials (AEM). LEAs can also request in-person or virtual training for their staff on any of these topics.

\* Collaborative university partnerships addressing critical needs and recruiting future educators through programs including the Speech-Language Pathology MA at Marshall University (MU) and West Virginia University (WVU), Speech-Language Pathology graduate/professional learning courses through WVU, Visually Impaired/Hard of Hearing Certification through MU, and the Autism Mentor Program at MU’s Autism Training Center.

Additionally, WVDE/OSE actively disseminates information from national OSEP-funded Technical Assistance Centers and other sources to ensure LEAs have access to the latest information, best practices, and resources.

**Stakeholder Engagement:**

**The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

WVDE/OSE fosters ongoing collaboration with stakeholders through a multifaceted engagement strategy. Key channels include:

DIRECT COMMUNICATION
\* One-on-one calls with parents, advocates, teachers, and other community members.

\* Monthly support calls with CSI-ATS school teams and special education directors.

\* Emails soliciting feedback from diverse stakeholder groups.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE
\* Utilizing a dedicated Teams site with LEAs.

\* Posting a public input form on the WVDE website for the SSIP.

\* Collecting parent, student, and school staff feedback during monitoring activities.

COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIPS
\* Regularly meeting and serving on interagency teams which focus on improving outcomes for persons with disabilities.

\* State director participation in all West Virginia Advisory Council for the Education of Exceptional Children (WVACEEC) meetings, incorporating participation, capacity building, and soliciting feedback from LEAs, parents, and community groups.

\* Periodic meetings and working relationships with legislators, attorneys, teacher organizations, and other interested parties.

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

NO

**Number of Parent Members:**

69

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The West Virginia Advisory Council for the Education of Exceptional Children (WVACEEC) is the State Advisory Council established in state code to comply with IDEA which mandates membership from the following demographic groups: individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities, teachers, higher education institutions, local administrators of programs for children with disabilities, other State agencies, advocacy and parent organizations, private schools, vocational/business communities, persons responsible for homeless children (McKinney-Vento Act), SEA officials, State welfare agency responsible for foster care, and/or State juvenile and adult corrections. The majority of the Council is mandated to be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. Some members serve in more than one role. Additionally, no more than two officers/employees of the State may be members.

WVACEEC sets the agenda for each meeting in collaboration with the WVDE, members of the council, and guest presenters. Meetings include a virtual option, and the physical locations are rotated throughout the state to provide more opportunities for public participation specific to unmet needs in a given geographic area. Meeting topics are designed to solicit input and feedback on SPP/APR Indicator priorities, local highlights, unmet needs, and concerns identified by parents, representative of statewide demographics.

WVDE/OSE also actively incorporates the needs of parents and strives to build the capacity of its diverse stakeholders through its outreach and communication efforts. Recognizing the potential complexity of educational data, the State team ensures clear and accessible presentation when engaging with parents. During presentations, information is clarified, explained in parent-friendly language, and contextualized to the purpose and function of each indicator. This dedication to transparency and communication empowers parents to actively participate in their child's education and contributes to a collaborative school environment.

WVDE/OSE participates in all WVACEEC meetings and features an SEA spotlight highlighting various components of general supervision at each meeting. The council participates in rich discussions and provides valuable feedback related to the Annual Compliance Report, initiatives designed to improve results for students with disabilities, including, but not limited to, the SSIP, policy updates, discussion of targets, and the collection and use of data at the SEA and LEA levels. This level of strong stakeholder engagement is crucial for effectively developing and evaluating improvement processes. Additionally, WVACEEC serves as a consultant to the West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE) on matters pertaining to unmet needs in special education throughout the state of West Virginia. WVACEEC submits an annual report each year to the WVBE. A description of the WVACEEC, meeting schedule, and annual reports are available publicly at [https://wvde.us/special-education/family-and-public-partnership/west-virginia-advisory-council-for-the-education-of-exceptional-children/].

WVDE/OSE regularly partners with the West Virginia Parent Training and Information, Inc. (WVPTI), a non-profit organization aimed at improving the lives and education of all children through an emphasis on children and youth with disabilities and special healthcare needs, to ensure accurate and meaningful information is available to parents through this support group. Examples of the work and support materials they share through the support and collaboration with WVDE/OSE are available on their website: [http://www.wvpti-inc.org/].

WVDE/OSE also actively participates on multiple statewide councils including, Developmental Disability Council (DD Council), Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC), State Rehab Council (SRC), Employment First, Olmstead Council, and WVACEEC. Stakeholders from these organizations often communicate appreciation to WVDE/OSE for strengthening their understanding of IDEA processes and enhancing communication between the SEA and these diverse stakeholder groups. WVDE/OSE works collaboratively with and seeks input from these stakeholder groups to develop strategies for continuous improvement and the evaluation of progress toward special education outcomes in West Virginia.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

WVDE continues to provide technical assistance and support that builds the capacity of West Virginia (WV) PreK-12 staff and stakeholders to work effectively with diverse groups of parents and to support the development of activities and programs designed to improve outcomes for SWD. Through partnerships with community members and parents, WVDE/OSE has been better able to understand and address complex issue such as disproportionality/exclusionary practices and toxic stress that impact students of color and of low socioeconomic status and their families.
The following activities are not exhaustive, but provide examples of initiatives offered through virtual and in-person activities throughout the reporting period.

LOCAL AND STATE-LEVEL INITIATIVES
WVDE recognizes the crucial role families play in student success and offers various avenues for parent and family engagement. LEAs, overseen by their local boards of education, have the flexibility to implement family engagement strategies tailored to their individual communities. To support these efforts, the WVDE/OSE provides dedicated support through a dedicated state-level family engagement coordinator. This coordinator acts as a bridge between parents, teachers, and administrators, fostering meaningful participation in all aspects of a child's education. This includes increasing parents' understanding of special education services, empowering their involvement in decision-making processes, and assisting LEAs in developing culturally responsive family engagement initiatives.

COMMUNITIES IN SCHOOLS (CIS)
WVDE is further invested in supporting families through the statewide CIS initiative. Dedicated site coordinators placed in participating schools serve as essential guides for parents navigating the complex landscape of educational and community resources. CIS ensures that parents from diverse backgrounds have access to the information and guidance they need to actively participate in their children's education and collaborate effectively with educators. As of SY 2022-23, CIS has site coordinators in schools throughout all 55 counties in West Virginia.

WV HEALTHY GRANDFAMILIES PROGRAM
The WVDE provided leadership in collaboration with WV legislators, WV Bureau of Senior Services, community members, and WV State University (WVSU) Extension’s Healthy GrandFamilies Programs (WVHGP), to establish a WVHGP in every school district. The program is evidence-based and designed specifically for grandparents raising school-age children. The program includes a series of 9 facilitated discussion groups, one focusing on public school programs, policies, and special education. The school-age children take part in reading and math, STEAM, and career exploratory activities within the program. Social workers, special education school staff, grandparents who have graduated from the program, and CIS staff provide ongoing support for those in the program and the completers. Program completers take part in program maintenance, family support, and recruitment.

PARENT EDUCATION RESOURCE CENTERS (PERCs)
Some LEAs continue to utilize locally funded PERCs to provide targeted support to families of children with disabilities. Staffed by parent-educator teams, PERCs offer diverse resources and training opportunities in areas such as parenting skills, problem-solving, educational planning, behavior management, and home learning activities. Notably, PERCs also provide individualized support to help families understand their children's specific needs and identify suitable resources and services.

COLLABORATION WITH ADVOCATES
Recognizing the importance of diverse voices, WVDE/OSE actively collaborates with state and private advocacy agencies. This collaboration strengthens the capacity of parents to participate in special education decision-making and progress evaluation, ensuring that underrepresented communities are heard in policy development and implementation. Additionally, this partnership provides families navigating the complexities of the special education system with valuable support and resources.

ENGAGING DIVERSE STAKEHOLDERS DURING POLICY 2419 REVISION
WVDE/OSE demonstrated its commitment to inclusive engagement during the revision process for Policy 2419. The proposed revisions were readily available on the SEA website, accompanied by advertisements in newspapers across the state for related in-person stakeholder meetings. WVDE/OSE representatives conducted in-person meetings in various locations, encompassing both urban and rural areas, to gather stakeholder input. By employing these diverse communication channels and addressing potential participation barriers, WVDE/OSE facilitated inclusive engagement and gathered a wide range of perspectives, informing the revised policy.

"READY READ WRITE” INITIATIVE – FAMILY RESOURCES
Further demonstrating its commitment to student success, the SEA launched "Ready Read Write" in SY 2022-23. This comprehensive initiative focuses on enhancing literacy proficiency for all West Virginia public school students, including those with disabilities. The program emphasizes evidence-based instructional practices aligned with the Science of Reading, focusing on explicit instruction in core reading components like phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Recognizing the particular importance of these skills for students with disabilities, "Ready Read Write" equips educators with tools and knowledge to implement effective, targeted interventions tailored to individual student needs. Additionally, the initiative actively promotes family engagement through a dedicated resource hub on the WVDE website [https://wvde.us/ready-read-write/families-guardians/]. This hub provides families with grade-specific and disability-inclusive literacy tips and strategies, empowering parents and caregivers to support their child's learning and collaborate effectively with educators.

In addition, and in partnership with the WV Family Engagement Center (Grant #U310A180062 from the U.S. Department of Education), the WVDE has supported SWD and their families by providing guidance, resources, and special education training for its staff and more than 1,700 parents. The WVFEC conducted listening tours that gave parents of SWD opportunities to learn and share. The WVDE has partnered with the WVFEC to enhance the participation of parents of SWD who are in Career and Technical Education programs to improve their completion and transition outcomes.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

WVDE/OSE solicits public input for setting and revising SPP/APR targets through collaboration with the West Virginia Advisory Council for the Education of Exceptional Children (WVACEEC). During SY 2022-23, the WVACEEC convened meetings that brought together a diverse group of stakeholders, including council members, parents of students with disabilities, educators, LEA special education directors, WVDE/OSE staff, and community members. These meetings were conducted both in-person and virtually via Microsoft Teams.

In October 2022, the WVDE/OSE reviewed statewide assessment data during a WVACEEC meeting and shared that 50 schools across the state had been identified as needing additional support due to underperformance within the special education subgroup. In response, the state educational agency (SEA) initiated a three-year Comprehensive Support and Improvement-Additional Targeted Support (CSI-ATS) project. This collaborative effort, in partnership with the WVDE Office of School Improvement, aims to provide dedicated support teams to schools facing challenges in meeting proficiency goals for students with disabilities.

Subsequently, at an April 2023 WVACEEC meeting, the WVDE/OSE presented and discussed indicator data from the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission. While conversations regarding state targets for results indicators were deferred, other critical topics took precedence. These included the implementation of the new statewide student information system (WVEIS 2.0), grade-level instruction within the least restrictive environment, and addressing behavior and mental health concerns. Stakeholders voiced interest in WVEIS updates and training, particularly for the online Individualized Education Program (IEP) platform integrated within WVEIS. Their valuable feedback has led to ongoing improvements to the system. Further, WVACEEC specifically recommended that WVDE/OSE provide support and resources to districts regarding Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) to ensure students with disabilities have access to the general curriculum with the understanding that effective SDI can ultimately lead to improved assessment outcomes in reading/language arts and math. The need for enhanced support in meeting behavioral and mental health needs of students with disabilities also emerged as another priority of the WVACEEC. WVDE/OSE acknowledges these critical needs and is actively pursuing solutions to address these important areas.

SOLICITING PUBLIC INPUT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL
As previously described in the General Supervision System section, Targeted Systemic Improvement Plans (TSIPs) address specific areas needing improvement in LEAs whose performance falls below state targets on the Annual Desk Audit (ADA). Data analysis conducted after the ADA informs the selection of at least one major area for each TSIP. Stakeholder engagement at the local level plays a crucial role in prioritizing these focus areas, ensuring community voices shape the improvement process. Stakeholders actively participate in all key stages of TSIP development, working collaboratively with LEAs to set measurable goals, select evidence-based and feasible activities to drive progress, and establish realistic implementation timelines. This broad engagement strengthens the commitment to achieving desired outcomes for students with disabilities and ensures the TSIPs reflect the needs of local communities. Successful implementation of TSIPs at the local level contributes directly to the State's progress toward its results targets.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

Targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle and related topics were reviewed at a public West Virginia Advisory Council for the Education of Exceptional Children (WVACEEC) meeting with a virtual streaming option available in Spring 2023. The WVACEEC also receives annual reports summarizing LEA and SEA outcomes following the Annual Desk Audit, release of the SPP/APR results, and annual SEA and LEA determinations. SPP/APR and Local APR data, recordings of stakeholder sessions, and surveys to solicit feedback were posted on WVDE/OSE website.

WVDE/OSE also makes key data publicly available on the SSIP webpage through an interactive dashboard, enabling stakeholders to track progress, identify areas for improvement, and hold LEAs and schools accountable. Stakeholders can explore graduation rates, dropout rates, secondary transition compliance, alternate assessment participation, and other critical metrics (e.g., LEA improvement plan focus areas, LEA determinations, monitoring years, SSIP grant award amounts) across various LEAs. Embedded tooltips provide clarity for specialized terms and acronyms, making the data accessible to a broader audience. The webpage also invites feedback from external stakeholders through an anonymous survey link. The feedback is used for continuous improvement of the website and resources. [https://wvde.us/special-education/wv-guideposts-to-graduation/]

For in-depth analysis, other publicly reported data are provided on the ZoomWV Dashboard: [https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/6161]. Data updates occur regularly following each collection certification (e.g., December child count data typically available by February).

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.**

West Virginia’s SPP/APR is posted annually no later than 120 days after the final report is loaded into EMAPS by OSEP. Both WVDE/OSE’s SPP/APR and LEA APRs are posted on the WVDE/OSE website [https://wvde.us/special-education/data-and-public-reporting/]. LEA APR data are provided in an online spreadsheet with instructions for navigation through the use of embedded hyperlinks. Each tab in the spreadsheet explains the indicator, provides the target(s), and displays all LEA data, including whether the LEA met the state target for the reporting year. Cell counts <10 and computed statistics (i.e., percentages) involving a numerator <10 or denominator <20 are suppressed to protect student privacy.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

To increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents, SY 2022-23 saw the development of pre-monitoring surveys and the enhancement of on-site parent forums to be implemented in SY 2023-24. Specifically, targeted parent surveys intended to actively solicit concerns regarding their children's education within special education will be distributed shortly before each LEA's WVDE/OSE monitoring review. Options to complete the survey from home or in person were designed to boost participation and collect comprehensive feedback, especially among underrepresented groups. Publicly announced on-site discussions will also be held during each monitoring visit. These forums will provide dedicated opportunities for any parent to voice their input, ask questions, and participate in understanding and enhancing their children's educational experience with a specific focus on special education. Both of these improvements to the monitoring process will lead to better identification and resolution of compliance and results concerns in SY 2023-24.

In an effort to assist parents in understanding the level of compliance and results expected for the delivery of special education related services, and build their capacity to understand their rights and advocate for the appropriate services and supports for their students, an “SPP/APR FFY 2020-2025 Indicator Guide” was developed, which provides essential information about each indicator in the SPP/APR including the measurements, their importance, the data sources and calculations, and West Virginia’s targets. Educators, school leadership, and special education directors also benefit from the guide's accessible explanations, enabling data-driven decision making, targeted improvement strategies, and increased transparency in achieving state goals. Overall, the guide serves as a potential tool for improved communication, collaboration, and ultimately, positive outcomes for all stakeholders in West Virginia's special education system. This guide is posted on the WVDE/OSE website [https://wvde.us/special-education/data-and-public-reporting/].

Further, during the revision process for Policy 2419, WVDE/OSE implemented a comprehensive outreach strategy to ensure widespread awareness and participation among parents from diverse backgrounds. This strategy extended beyond traditional channels to maximize accessibility and inclusivity. To further promote engagement, WVDE/OSE actively sought input through stakeholder meetings held in various locations throughout West Virginia, spanning both urban and rural communities. The proposed revisions were made readily available on the SEA website and advertisements regarding the schedule and locations of related in-person stakeholder meetings were circulated in newspapers across the state and shared through social media platforms, ensuring geographic reach. These meetings were intentionally scheduled during and after typical business hours to accommodate varied schedules and working hours, further removing potential barriers to participation. Representatives from WVDE/OSE facilitated these in-person sessions, sharing the proposed policy revisions, and actively gathering feedback from stakeholders. By employing these multiple communication channels and demonstrating flexibility in meeting times, WVDE/OSE aimed to facilitate inclusive engagement and gather a wide range of perspectives, enriching the policy revision process with diverse perspectives.

Additional required information may be found in the “Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities” section of the Introduction.

## Intro - OSEP Response

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 83.21% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 78.20% | 79.50% | 80.80% | 83.71% | 84.21% |
| Data | 75.68% | 76.86% | 78.70% | 83.97% | 84.38% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 84.71% | 85.21% | 85.71% | 86.21% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Graduation targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 2,031 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 181 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 19 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 16 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 185 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,031 | 2,432 | 84.38% | 84.71% | 83.51% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

As described in West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE) Policy 2510, Assuring the Quality of Education: Regulations for Education Programs – effective July 1, 2022, the graduation requirements for all WV youth, including those with IEPs, are the same: 22 total credits (12 prescribed and 10 personalized).

The specific requirements are as follows:
— English Language Arts = 4 credits (3 prescribed/1 personalized);
— Mathematics = 4 credits (2 prescribed/2 personalized);
— Science = 3 credits (2 prescribed/1 personalized);
— Social Studies = 4 credits (3 prescribed/1 personalized);
— Physical Education = 1 credit (prescribed);
— Health = 1 credit (prescribed);
— Art = 1 credit (personalized); and
— Personalized Education Plan (PEP) = 4 credits (personalized).

All courses needed for graduation require mastery of approved content standards (WV Code §126-42-6.2 High School Programming). In addition, all public secondary schools are required to offer programs of study for Career and Technical Education, Computer Science, World Languages, Driver Education, a Social Emotional Advisory System for Student Success, and no less than 4 AP course offerings per school year.

Link to WV Board of Education Policies: [https://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/] See Policy 2510 (pages 9-14).

**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

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 6.17% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target <= | 2.25% | 2.00% | 1.75% | 5.67% | 5.17% |
| Data | 0.99% | 0.87% | 0.73% | 4.61% | 6.04% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 4.67% | 4.17% | 3.67% | 3.17% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Dropout targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 2,031 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 181 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 19 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 16 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 185 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 185 | 2,432 | 6.04% | 4.67% | 7.61% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Effective July 2022, WVDE upgraded its student data system known as WVEIS allowing multiple systems to be fully integrated into a single streamlined and integrated data platform. Due to this transition between systems, LEAs were requested to complete their SY 2021-22 end-of-year collections as soon as possible after graduation occurred to ensure that all data was certified by superintendents prior to the transition to the new data system. Once the data collection was cleaned and analyzed, it appears there may have been multiple LEAs whose superintendent certified end-of-year data prior to special education directors completing the exit data for the 618 data collection. While this does not necessarily mean that data in the new system was incorrect, the state believes that, although there were challenges to the new system, the discrepancies were not meaningful enough to impact validity and reliability, but rather a timing issue related to certifications. This timing issue related to certifying the SY 2021-22 end-of-year collection may have contributed to 7 of our 55 LEAs having dropout rates greater than 20%. Of those 7 LEAs, 2 LEAs had dropouts of 100% (both reporting only 1 or 2 students as dropping out, but no reporting of any graduates or other exits from special education); 1 LEA with a dropout rate of 91% (10 dropouts and 1 graduate); and 1 LEA with a 38% dropout rate (this LEA has since been put under state accountability and monitoring for SY 2023-24); and 3 additional LEAs which had been struggling with student re-engagement after COVID.

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

Any student ages 14-21 who leaves school and does not enroll in another school or program that culminates in a high school diploma is considered to be a dropout.

West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE) Policy 4110: "Attendance" defines a dropout as an individual who was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled on October 1 of the current school year; or was not enrolled on October 1 of the previous school year although expected to be in membership (i.e., was not reported as a drop out the year before); and has not graduated from high school, obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (referred to as TASC [Test Assessing Secondary Completion], and/or HSEA High School Equivalency Assessment), or completed a state or LEA-approved education program; and does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another public school district, private school, registered home school or state or LEA-approved education program; (b) temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness; or (c) death.

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

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

When WVDE reviewed dropout rates for the remaining 48 LEAs with rates lower than 20% the statewide dropout rate would have been 5.59% (which while not meeting target, slippage would not have occurred). This analysis removed the 7 LEAs with data entry anomalies and is considered to be a more accurate representation for indicator 2. Potential data entry issues have been remediated by the issuance of new guidance described below and individual technical assistance provided to the 7 LEAs that may have had challenges with the conversion to the new data system.

NOTE: New guidance was developed to address data entry issues with the expectation that WV will meet drop out targets in the future. [https://wvde.us/special-education/data-and-public-reporting/] (Click "Special Education Data Maintenance and Collection" toggle area to access this guidance called “Maintaining Special Education Data in WVEIS”).

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 99.84% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 98.73% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 100.00% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2020 | 99.70% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2020 | 98.97% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2020 | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00%  | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline was originally set for FFY 2018 but the need for grade-level participation disaggregation moved the baseline to 2020. The stakeholders were presented with the participation expectations for both SPP/APR reporting and ESEA reporting and the rationale for the state to maintain a steady target of 95% participation. Stakeholders were informed of the state participation that has traditionally met or exceeded the participation rate of 95%, but no grade-level breakdowns were presented. Stakeholders broadly accepted the proposed target per grade level staying at 95%.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Assessment Participation targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 4,385 | 3,506 | 2,624 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 1,156 | 455 | 651 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 3,025 | 2,794 | 1,480 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards  | 200 | 243 | 199 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 4,385 | 3,506 | 2,624 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 1,157 | 453 | 651 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 3,027 | 2,792 | 1,480 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards  | 200 | 242 | 199 |

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 4,381 | 4,385 | 99.92% | 95.00% | 99.91% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 3,492 | 3,506 | 99.43% | 95.00% | 99.60% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2,330 | 2,624 | 99.95% | 95.00% | 88.80% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

A new version of WVEIS, the statewide student information system, was launched at the start of SY 2022-23 to integrate multiple data systems into a single, streamlined platform. This coincided with the conclusion of the prior academic year, placing a substantial workload on schools and districts, which may have impacted data quality assurance efforts. First, the 11th grade assessment (SAT School Day) utilizes a separate platform from the 4th and 8th grade assessments (WV Summative Assessment). Second, improved data tracking procedures may have contributed to some of the variances observed between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. For example, the previous system was not properly identifying all 11th grade students that did not take the exam, resulting in potentially inflated participation rates. Additional data validation processes were implemented to enhance data accuracy.

Student indifference towards the 11th grade assessment's purpose beyond high school graduation, particularly for students with disabilities, further complicates data interpretation. The perceived value of the assessment varies among students, affecting participation rates.

While the new system, along with the provided technical assistance and revised data quality review process, may have contributed to the identified variances, understanding the context surrounding data collection and student engagement is crucial for accurate interpretation.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 4,384 | 4,385 | 99.87% | 95.00% | 99.98% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 3,487 | 3,506 | 99.54% | 95.00% | 99.46% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2,330 | 2,624 | 99.95% | 95.00% | 88.80% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

A new version of WVEIS, the statewide student information system, was launched at the start of SY 2022-23 to integrate multiple data systems into a single, streamlined platform. This coincided with the conclusion of the prior academic year, placing a substantial workload on schools and districts, which may have impacted data quality assurance efforts. First, the 11th grade assessment (SAT School Day) utilizes a separate platform from the 4th and 8th grade assessments (WV Summative Assessment). Second, improved data tracking procedures may have contributed to some of the variances observed between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. For example, the previous system was not properly identifying all 11th grade students that did not take the exam, resulting in potentially inflated participation rates. Additional data validation processes were implemented to enhance data accuracy.

Student indifference towards the 11th grade assessment's purpose beyond high school graduation, particularly for students with disabilities, further complicates data interpretation. The perceived value of the assessment varies among students, affecting participation rates.

While the new system, along with the provided technical assistance and revised data quality review process, may have contributed to the identified variances, understanding the context surrounding data collection and student engagement is crucial for accurate interpretation.

**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.**

West Virginia uses the General Summative Assessment (GSA) to determine grade-level academic achievement standard proficiency in reading and math and the Alternate Summative Assessment (ASA) to determine alternate academic achievement standard proficiency in reading and math.

PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE – ALL STUDENTS – REGULAR ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/7310
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > State Assessment Results > State Assessment Subgroups
-Make sure the following filters are set:
--School Year – 2022-2023
--District/County – All Districts
--School – All Schools
--Grade Level – All grades (or set to check each grade that must be reported 4, 8, 11 separately)
--Population Group – Status

PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE – REGULAR AND ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/6161
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Assessment Participation and Performance
-Make sure the following filters are set:
--School Year – 2022-2023
--District/County – (999) State Reporting
--School – All Schools

PERFORMANCE BY CLASS/SUBGROUP – ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/28307
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Alternate Assessment Results
-Data may be filtered by school year.

PARTICIPATION RATES – WITH and WITHOUT ACCOMMODATIONS
The participation rates for students with and without accommodations in WV are available on the ZoomWV page by using the following breadcrumbs:
ZoomWV > Special Education > Links > IDEA Section 618 Public Reporting 2022-2023
-Participation and proficiency rates of students with IEPs and without IEPs (504 plans) using accommodations and not using accommodations are located under the assessment tab in the IDEA Section 618 Public Reporting 2022-2023 file.
-Participation rates of students with IEPs and without IEPs (504 plans) using accommodations broken down by district and school are located under the ‘Reading - SWD w Accomm’ and ‘Math - SWD w Accomm’ tabs.

PERFORMANCE BY DISABILITY CATEGORY– REGULAR AND ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/28285
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Assessment Results by Student Disabilities
-Data may be filtered by school year and by LEA.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

WVDE remains committed to continuous improvement in data accuracy and system usability and will be exploring ways to increase engagement and understanding of the 11th grade assessment's value for students with disabilities.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

## 3A - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 15.87% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 6.68% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2018 | 9.24% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 17.53% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 5.42% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2018 | 2.58% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 16.90% | 17.40% | 17.90% | 18.40% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 7.70% | 8.20% | 8.70% | 9.20% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 10.70% | 11.20% | 11.70% | 12.20% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 19.00% | 19.50% | 20.00% | 20.50% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 6.50% | 7.00% | 7.50% | 8.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 4.00% | 4.50% | 5.00% | 5.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was presented to stakeholders and updated based on the most current year of data that was not impacted by COVID-19 in order to get the most accurate picture of the current performance level of children with disabilities on the current statewide assessments. The targets were set to show improvement each year from FFY 2020 through 2025. The stakeholders indicated acceptance of these baselines and targets.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Assessment Proficiency (grade-level standards) targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 4,181 | 3,249 | 2,131 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 444 | 95 | 74 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 228 | 168 | 132 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 4,184 | 3,245 | 2,131 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 509 | 63 | 20 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 284 | 85 | 23 |

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 672 | 4,181 | 14.36% | 16.90% | 16.07% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 263 | 3,249 | 7.07% | 7.70% | 8.09% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 206 | 2,131 | 10.52% | 10.70% | 9.67% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

Effective reading and language arts instruction for students with disabilities in secondary grades relies on several key components, including access to diverse, grade-level texts that promote comprehension and critical thinking, qualified educators trained in evidence-based instructional strategies, efficient and effective progress monitoring systems, data-driven decision making, and collaboration between educators, specialists, and support personnel who work with students with disabilities. The ability of schools and LEAs to fully implement these components may be affected by a range of factors (e.g., budget constraints, teacher shortages and turnover, lack of dedicated time for collaboration), potentially leading to inconsistent outcomes.

Further, student indifference towards the 11th grade assessment's purpose beyond high school graduation, particularly for students with disabilities, further complicates data interpretation. The perceived value of the assessment varies among students, potentially affecting engagement and effort during testing.

It is difficult to determine with certainty whether the degree of slippage is a result of a true decrease in performance or due to chance variation from year to year.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 793 | 4,184 | 14.69% | 19.00% | 18.95% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 148 | 3,245 | 4.24% | 6.50% | 4.56% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 43 | 2,131 | 2.25% | 4.00% | 2.02% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

Effective mathematics instruction for students with disabilities in secondary grades requires high-quality curriculum materials, fully certified special educators, evidence-based instructional practices, differentiated and individualized instruction, frequent progress monitoring, and collaboration among teachers and staff who work with students with disabilities. Due to varying factors (e.g., budget constraints, teacher shortages and turnover, lack of dedicated time for collaboration), not all schools and LEAs may have the resources, capacity, or support to implement these components consistently and effectively.

Further, student indifference towards the 11th grade assessment's purpose beyond high school graduation, particularly for students with disabilities, further complicates data interpretation. The perceived value of the assessment varies among students, potentially affecting engagement and effort during testing.

It is difficult to determine with certainty whether the degree of slippage is a result of a true decrease in performance or due to chance variation from year to year.

**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.**

West Virginia uses the General Summative Assessment (GSA) to determine grade-level academic achievement standard proficiency in reading and math and the Alternate Summative Assessment (ASA) to determine alternate academic achievement standard proficiency in reading and math.

PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE – ALL STUDENTS – REGULAR ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/7310
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > State Assessment Results > State Assessment Subgroups
-Make sure the following filters are set:
--School Year – 2022-2023
--District/County – All Districts
--School – All Schools
--Grade Level – All grades (or set to check each grade that must be reported 4, 8, 11 separately)
--Population Group – Status

PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE – REGULAR AND ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/6161
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Assessment Participation and Performance
-Make sure the following filters are set:
--School Year – 2022-2023
--District/County – (999) State Reporting
--School – All Schools

PERFORMANCE BY CLASS/SUBGROUP – ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/28307
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Alternate Assessment Results
-Data may be filtered by school year.

PARTICIPATION RATES – WITH and WITHOUT ACCOMMODATIONS
The participation rates for students with and without accommodations in WV are available on the ZoomWV page by using the following breadcrumbs:
ZoomWV > Special Education > Links > IDEA Section 618 Public Reporting 2022-2023
-Participation and proficiency rates of students with IEPs and without IEPs (504 plans) using accommodations and not using accommodations are located under the assessment tab in the IDEA Section 618 Public Reporting 2022-2023 file.
-Participation rates of students with IEPs and without IEPs (504 plans) using accommodations broken down by district and school are located under the ‘Reading - SWD w Accomm’ and ‘Math - SWD w Accomm’ tabs.

PERFORMANCE BY DISABILITY CATEGORY– REGULAR AND ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/28285
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Assessment Results by Student Disabilities
-Data may be filtered by school year and by LEA.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The SEA intends to address reading and mathematics performance statewide with two broad initiatives:
-The goals of the “Ready, Read, Write” initiative are to equip LEAs with professional development on the Science of Reading, empower schools with data-driven self-assessment, support leadership teams in learning alignment and educator expertise, promote extended learning opportunities, and foster collaboration with universities for educator preparation. [https://wvde.us/ready-read-write/]
-The goals of the “Unite with Numeracy” initiative are to enhance teacher content knowledge, implement research-based practices, and increase student engagement. [https://wvde.us/unite-with-numeracy/]

Additionally, WVDE/OSE hired two instructional support coordinators to lead the efforts of the Comprehensive Support & Improvement, Additional Targeted Support Schools (CSI-ATS) teams. These CSI-ATS teams work closely with schools struggling to meet proficiency goals for students with disabilities. The three-year CSI-ATS project focuses heavily on instructional and inclusive practices and was initiated through a partnership between the WVDE/OSE and the Office of School Improvement. Through needs assessments, ongoing visits, and collaboration, these teams guide school improvement efforts.

WVDE anticipates that the combined efforts of the literacy and numeracy initiatives, and the CSI-ATS project will positively influence students' long-term educational outcomes.

\*NOTES ON SLIPPAGE\*
Compared to FFY 2021 data, the percentage of students in Group C scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards in Reading dropped by 0.85%. Results of a two-sample proportion test indicated that there is a nonsignificant, very small difference between FFY 2021's percentage (10.52%) and FFY 2022's percentage (9.67%), Z = 0.96, p = .336. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .03), suggesting that the practical impact of this decline is negligible. In other words, although this subgroup did not see year-to-year progress, the dip in performance from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 could be due to chance rather than any real decline in performance.

Compared to FFY 2021 data, the percentage of students in Group C scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards in Math dropped by 0.23%. Results of a two-sample proportion test indicated that there is a nonsignificant, very small difference between FFY 2021's percentage (2.25%) and FFY 2022's percentage (2.02%), Z = 0.66, p = .506. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .021), suggesting that the practical impact of this decline is negligible. In other words, although this subgroup did not see year-to-year progress, the dip in performance from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 could be due to chance rather than any real decline in performance.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 18.48% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 32.67% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2018 | 36.21% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 26.54% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 7.17% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2018 | 11.11% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 20.00% | 20.50% | 21.00% | 21.50% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 34.00% | 34.50% | 35.00% | 35.50% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 37.50% | 38.00% | 38.50% | 39.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 28.00% | 28.50% | 29.00% | 29.50% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 8.50% | 9.00% | 9.50% | 10.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 13.00% | 13.50% | 14.00% | 14.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was presented to stakeholders and updated based on the most current year of data that was not impacted by COVID-19 in order to get the most accurate picture of the current performance level of children with disabilities on the current statewide assessments. The targets were set to show improvement each year from FFY 2020 through 2025. The stakeholders indicated acceptance of these baselines and targets.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Assessment Proficiency (alternate standards) targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 200 | 243 | 199 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 32 | 52 | 66 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 200 | 242 | 199 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 74 | 14 | 48 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 32 | 200 | 11.63% | 20.00% | 16.00% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 52 | 243 | 18.57% | 34.00% | 21.40% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 66 | 199 | 32.21% | 37.50% | 33.17% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 74 | 200 | 33.72% | 28.00% | 37.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 14 | 242 | 6.33% | 8.50% | 5.79% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 48 | 199 | 29.81% | 13.00% | 24.12% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

-While Group B showed some progress in Reading with a small proficiency increase between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022, a similar positive trend was not observed in Math. It should also be noted that the data for FFY 2022 reflect the performance of a different cohort of students compared to FFY 2021. With that, classrooms in which students are instructed on alternate academic achievement standards often face challenges such as higher staff turnover, lower training for educators, and potentially lower expectations for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities regarding their academic skills. Additionally, although not reported specifically in this APR, the math proficiency rate for 7th graders taking the alternate assessment in SY 2022-23 was 12.20% (25 / 205 = 0.122), which suggests potential improvement for Group B as they transition to 8th grade.

**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.**

West Virginia uses the General Summative Assessment (GSA) to determine grade-level academic achievement standard proficiency in reading and math and the Alternate Summative Assessment (ASA) to determine alternate academic achievement standard proficiency in reading and math.

PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE – ALL STUDENTS – REGULAR ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/7310
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > State Assessment Results > State Assessment Subgroups
-Make sure the following filters are set:
--School Year – 2022-2023
--District/County – All Districts
--School – All Schools
--Grade Level – All grades (or set to check each grade that must be reported 4, 8, 11 separately)
--Population Group – Status

PARTICIPATION AND PERFORMANCE – REGULAR AND ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/6161
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Assessment Participation and Performance
-Make sure the following filters are set:
--School Year – 2022-2023
--District/County – (999) State Reporting
--School – All Schools

PERFORMANCE BY CLASS/SUBGROUP – ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/28307
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Alternate Assessment Results
-Data may be filtered by school year.

PARTICIPATION RATES – WITH and WITHOUT ACCOMMODATIONS
The participation rates for students with and without accommodations in WV are available on the ZoomWV page by using the following breadcrumbs:
ZoomWV > Special Education > Links > IDEA Section 618 Public Reporting 2022-2023
-Participation and proficiency rates of students with IEPs and without IEPs (504 plans) using accommodations and not using accommodations are located under the assessment tab in the IDEA Section 618 Public Reporting 2022-2023 file.
-Participation rates of students with IEPs and without IEPs (504 plans) using accommodations broken down by district and school are located under the ‘Reading - SWD w Accomm’ and ‘Math - SWD w Accomm’ tabs.

PERFORMANCE BY DISABILITY CATEGORY– REGULAR AND ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS
-https://zoomwv.k12.wv.us/Dashboard/dashboard/28285
-From the ZoomWV homepage, use the breadcrumbs: ZoomWV > Special Education > Assessment Results by Student Disabilities
-Data may be filtered by school year and by LEA.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

WVDE/OSE acknowledges the need for comprehensive support in this area. While the Comprehensive Support & Improvement, Additional Targeted Support (CSI-ATS) project provides direct support to schools struggling with proficiency goals, addressing the specific challenges impacting students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, such as providing targeted professional development for educators and fostering greater collaboration with administration to establish higher expectations, is crucial in ensuring equitable access to quality mathematics education and maximizing student potential.

\*NOTES ON SLIPPAGE\*
Compared to FFY 2021 data, the percent of students in Group B scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards in Math dropped by 0.54%. Results of a two-sample proportion test indicated that there is a nonsignificant, very small difference between FFY 2021's percentage (6.33%) and FFY 2022's percentage (5.79%), Z = 0.23, p = .818. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .021), suggesting that the practical impact of this decline is negligible. In other words, although this subgroup did not see year-to-year progress, the dip in performance from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 could be due to chance rather than any real decline in performance.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 32.44 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 36.58 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2018 | 42.29 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2018 | 29.27 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2018 | 30.80 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2018 | 21.24 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 29.00 | 28.50  | 28.00 | 27.50 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 35.00 | 34.50 | 34.00 | 33.50 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 40.50 | 40.00 | 39.50 | 39.00 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 27.00 | 26.50 | 26.00 | 25.50 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 28.00 | 27.50 | 27.00 | 26.50 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 20.00 | 19.50 | 19.00 | 18.50 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline data from FFY 2018 were calculated as the difference between the proficiency rate of children with disabilities and an IEP taking the state-wide assessments and the proficiency rate of ALL students taking the state-wide assessment. Disaggregation by subject area (math and reading) and grade level (4th, 8th, and 11th) was conducted prior to calculations. These calculations were presented and accepted by stakeholders during the final stakeholder meeting in September 2021.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Assessment Proficiency Gap (Grade Level Standards) targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts***

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 17,574 | 18,370 | 14,955 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 4,181 | 3,249 | 2,131 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 7,387 | 7,477 | 7,186 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 322 | 264 | 278 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 444 | 95 | 74 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 228 | 168 | 132 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/10/2024

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 17,578 | 18,361 | 14,955 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 4,184 | 3,245 | 2,131 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 7,516 | 4,922 | 3,086 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 411 | 150 | 78 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 509 | 63 | 20 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 284 | 85 | 23 |

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 16.07% | 43.87% | 29.13 | 29.00 | 27.79 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 8.09% | 42.14% | 31.92 | 35.00 | 34.04 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 9.67% | 49.91% | 39.84 | 40.50 | 40.24 | Met target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 18.95% | 45.10% | 26.70 | 27.00 | 26.14 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 4.56% | 27.62% | 22.65 | 28.00 | 23.06 | Met target | No Slippage |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2.02% | 21.16% | 18.58 | 20.00 | 19.14 | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3D - OSEP Response

## 3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 3.51% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target <= | 5.50% | 5.00% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% |
| Data | 3.51% | 3.51% | 3.51% | 1.75% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% | 3.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was presented to stakeholders and updated based on the most current year of data that was not impacted by COVID-19 in order to get the most accurate picture of the current level of satisfaction and involvement of parents of students with disabilities. The targets were set to show improvement in each 3-year cycle or sampling group from FFY 2020 through 2025. The stakeholders indicated acceptance of these baselines and targets.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Suspension/Expulsion targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

21

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3 | 36 | 0.00% | 3.50% | 8.33% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

As reported in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the COVID-19 pandemic caused widespread educational disruptions. The transition to remote or hybrid learning models, driven by local infection rates, likely had significant consequences for student development across academic, social, emotional, and behavioral domains. Upon returning to full-time, in-person learning (SY 2021-22), students with disabilities may have faced particular challenges readjusting to traditional school environments and meeting academic expectations. Furthermore, the pandemic may have exposed students to trauma or loss, potentially impacting their mental health and overall well-being. These factors, along with larger in-person class sizes, could have contributed to the observed increase in suspensions between SY 2020-21 and SY 2021-22. Increased student populations could have presented further challenges for teachers in effectively monitoring and managing student behavior, and potentially increased the frequency of student interactions and potential conflicts within the school environment.

**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**

DEFINITION OF “SIGNIFICANT DISCREPANCY” AND METHODOLOGY
West Virginia compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the state.

The state rate "bar" is two (2) times the state rate using SY 2016-17 as the baseline.

In SY 2016-17, the rate of suspensions/expulsions totaling greater than 10 days for children with IEPs was 1.62% ([751 suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days] / [46,299 children with IEPs ages 3-21] x 100 = 1.62%).

The 1.62% state rate was multiplied by two (2) to establish a static suspension/expulsion-rate bar for children with IEPs at 3.24%. Thus, an LEA is considered to have a “significant discrepancy” when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs is two (2) times the state rate (i.e., 3.24%) or higher.

The minimum n-size (denominator) of 20 is based on the number of children with IEPs in an LEA and is consistent with the SEA's minimum n-size for ESEA accountability reporting for subgroups.

The minimum cell size (numerator) of 5 is based on the total number of children with IEPs in an LEA who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days during the reporting period. The cell size of 5 is intended to balance out the conservative threshold that constitutes a significant discrepancy, thereby only including LEAs in which systemic issues are likely contributing to the higher rates of suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days.

The calculation includes the number of children with IEPs suspended/expelled greater than 10 days in an LEA as the numerator, and the number of children with IEPs in an LEA as the denominator, multiplied by 100.

Only LEAs that meet the State-established minimum n (20) and cell (5) size are included in the analysis.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Although reflected in the total number of LEAs in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR Introduction, four (4) public charter schools did not exist in SY 2021-22 and are not included in the total number of LEAs for this indicator as they did not open in WV until SY 2022-23.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.**

Following the identification of three (3) LEAs with a significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities, an on-site review was conducted by WVDE/OSE of each LEA's policies, procedures, and practices pertaining to the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards.

These reviews were completed on up to ten (10), but no fewer than five (5), student files per LEA, with the file selections providing a reasonable sample from diverse school settings. Using a dedicated checklist, each selected file was thoroughly examined in the following areas:

- West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS) Data Entry Verification: Confirmed the accuracy of suspension/expulsion and attendance data reported in WVEIS.
- General Procedures for Disciplinary Removals: Evaluated district policies and procedures for suspension and expulsion to ensure compliance with federal and state regulations.
- Individualized Education Programs (IEPs): Evaluated the development, implementation, and effectiveness of IEPs in addressing the needs of students with disabilities and preventing disciplinary issues.
- Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions (PBIS): Examined district implementation of PBIS strategies to prevent and address challenging behaviors, including the existence, adequacy, and implementation of behavior intervention plans (BIP) resulting from functional behavior assessment (FBA) data.
- Manifestation Determination Reviews (MDR): Verified whether the behaviors subject to disciplinary actions were determined to be a manifestation of the student’s disability.
- Procedural Safeguards: Verified the LEA informed parents/guardians of their rights during disciplinary proceedings.
- Interim Alternative Educational Settings and Instructional Services (IAES): Examined the availability and quality of educational services provided during disciplinary removals.

The three (3) LEAs received a “Yes” (Y) or “No” (N) determination for each area reviewed based on the established criteria, indicating compliance or noncompliance with related state and federal regulatory requirements. Compliance for some issues was assessed solely through individual student records, while others necessitated consideration of additional documentation. Any instance of noncompliance identified through this review resulted in the LEA being flagged as having policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities.

The following were identified across the three (3) LEAs as potentially contributing to the significant discrepancies observed for Indicator 4A:
- Proper documentation was not generated until after the suspension, thus hindering timely notifications and appropriate adjustments to the student’s IEP.
- MDRs were not conducted within targeted IEP meetings, precluding the consideration and implementation of other accommodations, services, or supports to prevent recurrence of the behavior(s) that resulted in the suspension(s).
- Incomplete records in several student files impeded proper review and decision-making.
- Students were suspended for behaviors not recommended in WVBE Policy 4373: Expected Behavior in Safe and Supportive Schools.
- Students were suspended for skipping class/tardiness in contradiction with W. Va. Code §18A-5-1.
- There was a lack of justification for Level 4 Offenses not recommended for expulsion.
- Misapplication of “change of placement” criteria led to unnecessary MDRs.
- Students whose conduct in question was caused by or had a direct and substantial relationship to the student’s disability were not immediately returned to school, or received further suspensions for the same or similar behaviors.
- Mismatched attendance/discipline reports contributed to potentially inaccurate behavior code usage.

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**If YES, select one of the following:**

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023*.***

The three (3) LEAs subsequently received written file review summaries detailing the extent and nature of any identified noncompliance for each student file, as well as recommendations for revising any LEA policies, practices, and/or procedures which were identified as potentially contributing to the significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities.

LEAs were further advised that WVDE/OSE would conduct a review of updated data for up to five (5) additional student files during the following school year to confirm that LEA policies, procedures, and/or practices were revised and are being implemented to meet the compliance requirements of IDEA 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not report that noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b) was corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

FFYs 2019 & 2020 FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE VERIFIED AS CORRECTED

FFY 2019 – 2 LEAs
"Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"

Correct implementation of the specific regulatory requirements was verified through a review of updated data for the two (2) LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2019. Subsequent file reviews were conducted by WVDE/OSE to verify correction of noncompliance for each systemic issue previously identified. Ongoing feedback and technical assistance were provided by WVDE/OSE after each subsequent review. Upon completion of subsequent reviews, WVDE/OSE verified that the two (2) LEAs were each correctly implementing state and federal regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Further, the two (2) LEAs each met the performance target for Indicator 4A the following school year.

"Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected"

Of the six (6) individual cases of noncompliance from the two (2) LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy, WVDE/OSE verified through a subsequent review of updated data obtained from WVEIS or an on-site visit that two (2) students were no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, and that the other four (4) individual cases of noncompliance were verified as corrected when those students were no longer being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in a school year, or, if suspensions/expulsions exceeded 10 days, the subsequent reviews of those student files indicated compliance with the relevant regulatory requirements.

FFY 2020 – 1 LEA
"Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements"

An updated file review for a new sample of students showed zero (0) students with IEPs were suspended or expelled for more than 10 days during the following school year (i.e., SY2020-21) in the one (1) LEA previously identified with noncompliance. Therefore, the one (1) LEA was verified as compliant consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, and WVDE/OSE considers the one (1) LEA to be correctly implementing the requirements for Indicator 4A.

"Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected"

Of the nine (9) individual cases of noncompliance from the one (1) LEA identified as having a significant discrepancy, WVDE/OSE verified through a subsequent review of updated data obtained from WVEIS or an on-site visit that one (1) student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, and that the other eight (8) cases of noncompliance were verified as corrected as those students were no longer being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in a school year.

\*4A METHODOLOGY\*

WVDE/OSE applied the Indicator 4A methodology used in FFY 2021 to the discipline data reported for FFY 2022 to assess whether the current methodology adequately examined and detected significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in WV. Over half of the LEAs in WV (36/57 = 63.16%) were included in the analysis of FFY 2022 data due to their having met the minimum n- and cell size requirements. As suspected, the Indicator 4A data reported for FFY 2022 were markedly different from the data reported in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, which were affected by COVID-19’s impact on schools. Due to the significant increase in the number of LEAs included in the analysis from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the methodology remained the same; however, WVDE/OSE will seek stakeholder feedback regarding whether the methodology for Indicator 4A should be revised prior to the next reporting cycle.

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2022 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

 A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 5.26% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 7.02% | 5.26% | 3.51% | 5.26% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

23

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 2 | 34 | 0.00% | 0% | 5.88% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable**

As reported in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the COVID-19 pandemic caused widespread educational disruptions. The transition to remote or hybrid learning models, driven by local infection rates, likely had significant consequences for student development across academic, social, emotional, and behavioral domains. Upon returning to full-time, in-person learning (SY 2021-22), students with disabilities may have faced particular challenges readjusting to traditional school environments and meeting academic expectations. Furthermore, the pandemic may have exposed students to trauma or loss, potentially impacting their mental health and overall well-being. These factors, along with larger in-person class sizes, could have contributed to the observed increase in suspensions between SY 2020-21 and SY 2021-22. Increased student populations could have presented further challenges for teachers in effectively monitoring and managing student behavior, and potentially increased the frequency of student interactions and potential conflicts within the school environment.

**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

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

DEFINITION OF “SIGNIFICANT DISCREPANCY” AND METHODOLOGY
West Virginia compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the state.

The state rate "bar" is two (2) times the state rate using SY 2016-17 as the baseline.

In SY2016-17, the rate of suspensions/expulsions totaling greater than 10 days for children with IEPs was 1.62% ([751 suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days] / [46,299 children with IEPs ages 3-21] x 100 = 1.62%).

The 1.62% state rate was multiplied by two (2) to establish a static suspension/expulsion-rate bar for children with IEPs at 3.24%. Thus, an LEA is considered to have a “significant discrepancy” when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs by race/ethnicity is two (2) times the state rate (i.e., 3.24%) or higher.

The minimum n-size (denominator) of 20 is based on the number of children with IEPs of a particular race/ethnicity in an LEA and is consistent with the SEA's minimum n-size for ESEA accountability reporting for subgroups.

The minimum cell size (numerator) of 5 is based on the total number of children with IEPs of a particular race/ethnicity in an LEA who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days during the reporting period. The cell size of 5 is intended to balance out the conservative threshold that constitutes a significant discrepancy, thereby only including LEAs in which systemic issues are likely contributing to the higher rates of suspension/expulsion greater than 10 days.

The calculation includes the number of children with IEPs of a particular race/ethnicity suspended/expelled greater than 10 days in an LEA as the numerator, and the number of children with IEPs of a particular race/ethnicity in an LEA as the denominator, multiplied by 100.

Only LEAs that meet the State-established minimum n (20) and cell (5) size are included in the analysis.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Although reflected in the total number of LEAs in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR Introduction, four (4) public charter schools did not exist in SY 2021-22 and are therefore not included in the total number of LEAs for this indicator as they did not open in WV until SY 2022-23.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.**

Following the identification of two (2) LEAs with a significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities by race/ethnicity, an on-site review was conducted by WVDE/OSE of each LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards. These reviews were completed on up to ten (10), but no fewer than five (5), student files per LEA, with the file selections providing a reasonable sample from diverse school settings. Using a dedicated checklist, each selected file was thoroughly examined in the following areas:

- West Virginia Education Information System (WVEIS) Data Entry Verification: Confirmed the accuracy of suspension/expulsion and attendance data reported in WVEIS.
- General Procedures for Disciplinary Removals: Evaluated district policies and procedures for suspension and expulsion to ensure compliance with federal and state regulations.
- Individualized Education Programs (IEPs): Evaluated the development, implementation, and effectiveness of IEPs in addressing the needs of students with disabilities and preventing disciplinary issues.
- Positive Behavior Supports and Interventions (PBIS): Examined district implementation of PBIS strategies to prevent and address challenging behaviors, including the existence, adequacy, and implementation of behavior intervention plans (BIP) resulting from functional behavior assessment (FBA) data.
- Manifestation Determination Reviews (MDR): Verified whether the behaviors subject to disciplinary actions were determined to be a manifestation of the student's disability.
- Procedural Safeguards: Verified whether the LEA informed parents/guardians of their rights during disciplinary proceedings.
- Interim Alternative Educational Settings and Instructional Services (IAES): Examined the availability and quality of educational services provided during disciplinary removals.

The two (2) LEAs received a "Yes" (Y) or "No" (N) determination for each area reviewed based on the established criteria, indicating compliance or noncompliance with related state and federal regulatory requirements. Compliance for some issues was assessed solely through individual student records, while others necessitated consideration of additional documentation. Any instance of noncompliance identified through this review resulted in the LEA being flagged as having policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities by race/ethnicity.

The following were identified across the two (2) LEAs as potentially contributing to the significant discrepancies observed for Indicator 4B:
- Certain MDRs were held without justification
- Students were suspended in some instances for behaviors not recommended in WVBE Policy 4373: Expected Behavior in Safe and Supportive Schools
- Students were suspended in some instances for skipping class/tardiness in contradiction with W. Va. Code §18A-5-1
- There were inconsistencies in the length of suspensions for similar behaviors
- All relevant information, including IEPs and BIPs, was not considered in a sample of MDR meetings.
- There was a lack of documentation from specific schools within the LEAs
- Certain descriptions of behaviors did not align with the assigned behavior codes
- There was unclear documentation of special education services during out-of-school suspensions (11+ days)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**If YES, select one of the following:**

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023*.***

The two (2) LEAs subsequently received written file review summaries detailing the extent and nature of any identified noncompliance for each student file, as well as recommendations for revising any LEA policies, practices, and/or procedures which were identified as potentially contributing to the significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities by race/ethnicity.

LEAs were further advised that WVDE/OSE would conduct a review of updated data for up to five (5) additional student files for each race/ethnicity category identified with a significant discrepancy during the following school year to confirm that LEA policies, procedures, and/or practices were revised and are now being implemented to meet the compliance requirements of IDEA 34 CFR §300.170(b).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State’s LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State’s chosen methodology.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

WVDE/OSE applied the Indicator 4B methodology used in FFY 2021 to the discipline data reported for FFY 2022 to assess whether the current methodology adequately examined and detected significant discrepancies in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs by race/ethnicity in WV. Over half of the LEAs in WV (34/57 = 59.65%) were included in the analysis of FFY 2022 data due to their having met the minimum n- and cell size requirements. As suspected, the Indicator 4B data reported for FFY 2022 were markedly different from the data reported in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, which were affected by COVID-19’s impact on schools. Due to the significant increase in the number of LEAs included in the analysis from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, the methodology remained the same; however, WVDE/OSE will seek stakeholder feedback regarding whether the methodology for Indicator 4B should be revised prior to the next reporting cycle.

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that each district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 has corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 62.80% | 63.00% | 63.80% | 67.11% | 67.61% |
| A | 67.11% | Data | 64.64% | 63.56% | 63.04% | 67.11% | 65.18% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 8.90% | 8.89% | 8.88% | 6.47% | 6.30% |
| B | 6.47% | Data | 7.47% | 7.57% | 7.41% | 6.47% | 6.57% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 1.40% | 1.30% | 1.30% | 1.49% | 1.40% |
| C | 1.49% | Data | 1.60% | 1.60% | 1.47% | 1.49% | 1.50% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 68.11% | 68.61% | 69.11% | 69.61% |
| Target B <= | 6.20% | 6.10% | 6.00% | 5.90% |
| Target C <= | 1.40% | 1.40% | 1.40% | 1.40% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was adjusted to FFY 2020 based on direction by OSEP during the clarification period in order to exclude 5-year-olds in kindergarten. Targets were then adjusted to show the 0.5% increase per year for indicator 5A, 0.1 decreases per year for indicator 5B, and a slight decrease to 1.4 for indicator 5C and then holding at that level. These were the increments that were presented to and accepted by stakeholders. Indicator 5C does not show a decrease due to the need to keep a continuum of services available for students.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Education Environments (School Age) targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 43,416 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 28,737 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 4,535 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 59 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 90 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 257 |

**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 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 28,737 | 43,416 | 65.18% | 68.11% | 66.19% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 4,535 | 43,416 | 6.57% | 6.20% | 10.45% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 406 | 43,416 | 1.50% | 1.40% | 0.94% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B** | A new version of WVEIS, the statewide student information system, was launched at the start of SY 2022-23 to integrate multiple data systems into a single, streamlined platform. The recent increase in students reported spending less than 40% of their day in the general education setting coincides with the launch of the new WVEIS system. Potential explanations are being investigated that could be contributing to this observed change:-A modest decrease (-234) in the number of students receiving services in homebound/hospital settings and residential facilities was observed. This suggests a potential reintegration of these students into regular school settings, which could contribute to the higher number spending less time in regular classrooms, as they may require additional, targeted support for successful adaptation. In contrast to some states which utilize dedicated special education day schools for students with complex behavioral needs, WV primarily provides such services within its traditional school settings. - A modest rise (+246) in the state's population of students with disabilities might have also contributed to this increase. With more students requiring specialized support, some schools may be facing challenges in accommodating their individualized needs entirely within regular classrooms for the full day. -Exacerbating these internal factors is the nationwide shortage of both general and special educators [Source: https://www.ed.gov/raisethebar/educators]. This scarcity of qualified personnel can restrict some schools' ability to provide adequate support for certain students with IEPs within regular classrooms throughout the entire school day.-The transition to the new student information system involved complex adjustments, data migration, implementation of new collection and reporting methods, and addressing unexpected technical issues. -User familiarity with the new system is also evolving, and some inconsistencies in data entry are possible.  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To ensure accurate data entry using the new WVEIS, WVDE/OSE is providing targeted training and support to users, emphasizing the importance of data quality and thorough review before submission. New guidance was developed to address data entry issues [https://wvde.us/special-education/data-and-public-reporting/]. Click the “Special Education Data Maintenance and Collection” toggle to access the guidance called “Maintaining Special Education Data in WVEIS.”

WVDE is committed to continuous monitoring and validation efforts. Through ongoing user training, refined reporting methods, and data validation procedures, WVDE/OSE strives to ensure that the data accurately reflect the actual placements and experiences of WV students.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.

 C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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 ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).

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 IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| **A** | Target >= | 32.30% | 32.30% | 32.80% | 49.24% | 49.75% |
| **A** | Data | 32.55% | 34.18% | 39.60% | 49.24% | 53.08% |
| **B** | Target <= | 10.30% | 10.30% | 10.20% | 9.67% | 9.50% |
| **B** | Data | 8.53% | 8.39% | 9.74% | 9.67% | 6.30% |
| **C** | Target <= |  |  |  | 2.26% | 2.25% |
| **C** | Data |  |  |  | 2.26% | 0.89% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was adjusted to FFY 2020 based on direction by OSEP during the clarification period in order to exclude 5-year-olds in kindergarten. Targets were then adjusted to show a 0.5% increase per year for indicator 6A, and a 0.1 decrease per year for indicator 6B. Indicator 6C is new and was established using FFY 2020 data for the baseline and a slight decrease each year. These were the increments that were presented to and accepted by stakeholders. Indicator 5C does not show a decrease due to the need to keep a continuum of services available for students.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Preschool Environments targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 49.24% |
| **B** | 2020 | 9.67% |
| **C** | 2020 | 2.26% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 50.25% | 50.75% | 51.25% | 51.75% |
| Target B <= | 9.40% | 9.30% | 9.20% | 9.10% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 2.24% | 2.23% | 2.22% | 2.21% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

08/30/2023

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 1,080 | 1,604 | 873 | 3,557 |
| 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 | 572 | 898 | 468 | 1,938 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 152 | 209 | 114 | 475 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 9 | 9 | 4 | 22 |

**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 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 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 | 1,938 | 3,557 | 53.08% | 50.25% | 54.48% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 475 | 3,557 | 6.30% | 9.40% | 13.35% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Home | 22 | 3,557 | 0.89% | 2.24% | 0.62% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

A new version of WVEIS, the statewide student information system, was launched at the start of SY 2022-23 to integrate multiple data systems into a single, streamlined platform. The recent increase in students reported receiving special education services in a “separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility” coincides with the launch of the new WVEIS system. Potential explanations are being investigated that could be contributing to this observed change:

-These data coincide with slippage in early childhood development indicators, particularly in the areas of social-emotional and behavioral development (indicators 7A1, 7A2, 7C1, and 7C2). This observation aligns with existing research indicating negative pandemic impacts on young children's social-emotional and cognitive skills, potentially leading to increased social-emotional and behavioral challenges. Schools may be attempting to address these challenges through dedicated support environments for children who may need additional social-emotional and behavioral support to meet their individual needs.

-The transition to the new student information system involved complex adjustments, data migration, implementation of new collection and reporting methods, and addressing unexpected technical issues.

-User familiarity with the new system is also evolving, and some inconsistencies in data entry are possible.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To ensure accurate data entry using the new WVEIS, WVDE/OSE is providing targeted training and support to users, emphasizing the importance of data quality and thorough review before submission. New guidance was developed to address data entry issues [https://wvde.us/special-education/data-and-public-reporting/]. Click the “Special Education Data Maintenance and Collection” toggle to access the guidance called “Maintaining Special Education Data in WVEIS.”

WVDE is committed to continuous monitoring and validation efforts. Through ongoing user training, refined reporting methods, and data validation procedures, WVDE/OSE strives to ensure that the data accurately reflect the actual placements and experiences of WV students.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 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 3 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**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| A1 | 2019 | Target >= | 78.50% | 79.00% | 79.50% | 84.50% | 85.00% |
| A1 | 84.47% | Data | 81.44% | 82.50% | 84.47% | 84.32% | 83.65% |
| A2 | 2019 | Target >= | 67.50% | 68.00% | 68.00% | 64.32% | 64.40% |
| A2 | 64.31% | Data | 64.34% | 63.32% | 64.31% | 61.52% | 62.88% |
| B1 | 2019 | Target >= | 78.50% | 79.00% | 79.50% | 83.51% | 84.00% |
| B1 | 83.50% | Data | 82.05% | 82.98% | 83.50% | 84.01% | 83.37% |
| B2 | 2019 | Target >= | 63.50% | 64.00% | 64.00% | 62.92% | 63.00% |
| B2 | 62.91% | Data | 62.79% | 61.51% | 62.91% | 59.17% | 60.11% |
| C1 | 2019 | Target >= | 79.50% | 80.00% | 80.50% | 86.29% | 86.80% |
| C1 | 86.28% | Data | 84.48% | 85.57% | 86.28% | 84.31% | 85.53% |
| C2 | 2019 | Target >= | 78.50% | 79.00% | 80.00% | 74.91% | 75.00% |
| C2 | 74.90% | Data | 74.41% | 73.72% | 74.90% | 69.57% | 70.95% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 85.50% | 86.00% | 86.50% | 87.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 64.50% | 64.60% | 64.70% | 64.80% |
| Target B1 >= | 84.50% | 85.00% | 85.50% | 86.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 63.10% | 63.20% | 63.30% | 63.40% |
| Target C1 >= | 87.30% | 87.80% | 88.30% | 88.80% |
| Target C2 >= | 75.10% | 75.20% | 75.30% | 75.40% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was adjusted to FFY 2020 based on direction by OSEP during the clarification period in order to exclude 5-year-olds in kindergarten. Targets were then adjusted to show a 0.5% increase per year for indicator 6A, and a 0.1 decrease per year for indicator 6B. Indicator 6C is new and was established using FFY 2020 data for the baseline and a slight decrease each year. These were the increments that were presented to and accepted by stakeholders. Indicator 5C does not show a decrease due to the need to keep a continuum of services available for students.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Preschool Outcomes targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

2,467

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 74 | 3.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 296 | 12.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 587 | 23.79% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,124 | 45.56% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 386 | 15.65% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,711 | 2,081 | 83.65% | 85.50% | 82.22% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,510 | 2,467 | 62.88% | 64.50% | 61.21% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 80 | 3.24% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 301 | 12.20% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 600 | 24.32% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,188 | 48.16% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 298 | 12.08% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 1,788 | 2,169 | 83.37% | 84.50% | 82.43% | Did not meet target | No 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,486 | 2,467 | 60.11% | 63.10% | 60.24% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 67 | 2.72% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 249 | 10.09% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 437 | 17.71% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,160 | 47.02% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 554 | 22.46% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 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.*Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*  | 1,597 | 1,913 | 85.53% | 87.30% | 83.48% | 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. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,714 | 2,467 | 70.95% | 75.10% | 69.48% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A1** | While the FFY 2022 data reaffirms the program's effectiveness in supporting initially below-average children to excel in social-emotional development, a slight slippage compared to FFY 2021's data (83.65% to 82.22%) is noted. Potential contributing factors may include lingering effects of pandemic disruptions impacting social interaction, resource limitations for teachers due to potential turnover, and individual variations in children's needs. |
| **A2** | Although reaching expected levels of social-emotional skills by program exit remains relatively high at 61.21%, the slight dip from the previous year's 62.88% is noted. Potential factors like resource limitations due to staff turnover, changes in intake demographics (e.g., age differences, varied prior experiences, different needs), or other unforeseen challenges could be hindering further progress.  |
| **C1** | Although the program data shows continued success in supporting children who entered below age expectations in using appropriate behaviors to meet their needs, a slight decrease from FFY 2021 (85.53%) to FFY 2022 (83.48%) is noted. While potential contributors to this dip could include adjustments to program interventions, variations in staff expertise, evolving needs of the incoming cohort, or other external factors impacting children's behavior, West Virginia is actively taking steps to address these challenges (see “additional information” section). |
| **C2** | Pre-k students with IEPs attaining age-expected behavior for using appropriate behaviors slightly decreased from 70.95% in FFY 2021 to 69.48% in FFY 2022. This minor change could be attributed to several factors, such as changes in intake demographics with a higher proportion of children facing challenges, resource limitations impacting individual attention and support, or other external factors affecting children's ability to demonstrate expected behavior. |

**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

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |

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

YES

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

WV’s Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process is a part of the WV Early Learning Reporting System (ELRS). ELRS is the online platform where all Universal Pre-K program and child assessment data is maintained, including preschool special education and the COS process. The program data includes school and classroom data, annual WV Universal Pre-k Health and Safety Checklist results, county collaborative early childhood core team information, and the Child Outcome Summary data. Child assessment data include child assessment checkpoints and child outcome summary forms for special education reporting requirements. Through data input, the ELRS: Pre-k provides output reports for individual child support and instruction, classroom, school, and program continuous quality improvement planning. The system includes a process for students eligible for preschool special education that identifies that student with an Individual Education Program (IEP) and generates the online COS rating form. The primary assessments used in WV are broad-based and look at the whole child for functioning and being successful in the home, school, and community and to function at the level of their typically developing, same-age peers.

The Early Learning Scale and other assessments are completed as part of the ongoing formative assessment process and entered into the Early Learning Reporting System three times per year during checkpoint periods. The Child Outcome Summary Form is also completed as part of the process to assist with ongoing teacher-driven instruction for all students. The Child Outcomes Summary Form is completed after it is determined that the child qualifies for special education. The team members for Eligibility and/or the IEP team can review all the information that was presented to determine the initial ratings. It is also recommended that a team representative review this information with the preschool receiving teacher if they were not at the meeting to enter the summary form information into the ELRS. The ratings should be completed by a team of individuals, including the parent(s), who have experience and/or knowledge of the students' functioning across a variety of settings and situations. The information available to the team can include but need not be limited to: age reference assessments (standardized, norm-referenced); observations; and, portfolios, service provider notes, interviews, and/or information from other partners such as WV Birth to Three (WVBTT) and/or related service personnel. To complete the ratings the team should use multiple sources of information which are typically collected as part of the IEP planning for a student. The purpose is to gather the information to get an overall picture of how the child functions across a variety of settings in their life. The initial rating is completed at entry, and the exit rating is completed before the student exits the program. The exit data for the COS process is determined as that child exits early childhood preschool special education and/or transitions into kindergarten or if the child moves out of the state and/or enrolls in a private school.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

\*SLIPPAGE 7A1\*

To address these challenges, WV is actively taking positive steps, including increasing staff for targeted behavioral support, increasing the availability of training to all pre-k staff on the child outcome summary process, and exploring strategies to retain experienced personnel. This enhanced support and training can lead to a deeper understanding of individual needs and enable the development of targeted interventions to ensure optimal social-emotional development for WV preschool students with IEPs.

NOTE: The difference between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data for 7A1 is 1.43%. Results of a two-sample proportion test indicated that there is a nonsignificant, very small difference between FFY 2021's 7A1 percentage (83.65%) and FFY 2022's 7A1 percentage (82.22%), Z = 1.18, p = .238. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .037), suggesting that the practical impact of this decline is negligible. In other words, although this subgroup did not see year-to-year progress, the dip in performance from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 for 7A1 could be due to chance rather than any real decline in performance.

\*SLIPPAGE 7A2\*

Analyzing data at the LEA level, along with the ongoing staff expansion and data training mentioned in "SLIPPAGE 7A1" above, can guide efforts to continue growth and achieve anticipated progress where possible. Additionally, exploring strategies to retain experienced personnel and mitigate the impact of potential turnover can further support program stability and improve outcomes for WV’s pre-k children with IEPs.

NOTE: The difference between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data for 7A2 is 1.68%. Results of a two-sample proportion test indicated that there is a nonsignificant, very small difference between FFY 2021's 7A2 percentage (62.88%) and FFY 2022's 7A2 percentage (61.21%), Z = 1.22, p = .223. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .035), suggesting that the practical impact of this decline is negligible. In other words, although this subgroup did not see year-to-year progress, the dip in performance from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 for 7A2 could be due to chance rather than any real decline in performance.

\*SLIPPAGE 7C1\*

Staff expansion for targeted behavioral support and ongoing training for all pre-k staff on the child outcome summary process will support the program's goal of achieving expected outcomes in appropriate behavior.

NOTE: The difference between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data for 7C1 is 2.05%. Results of a two-sample proportion test indicated that there is a nonsignificant, very small difference between FFY 2021's 7C1 percentage (85.53%) and FFY 2022's 7C1 percentage (83.48%), Z = 1.68, p = .093. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .055), suggesting that the practical impact of this decline is negligible. In other words, although this subgroup did not see year-to-year progress, the dip in performance from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 for 7C1 could be due to chance rather than any real decline in performance.

\*SLIPPAGE 7C2\*

West Virginia is proactively addressing potential contributors to slippage through increased staff for targeted behavioral support and comprehensive training for all pre-k staff on the child outcome summary process. This combination of enhanced support and data analysis can identify subgroups needing additional support, inform resource allocation, and ultimately enable pre-k children with IEPs in WV to develop and display appropriate behaviors for successful transitions to kindergarten and beyond.

NOTE: The difference between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data for 7C2 is 1.48%. Results of a two-sample proportion test indicated that there is a nonsignificant, very small difference between FFY 2021's 7C2 percentage (70.95%) and FFY 2022's 7C2 percentage (69.48%), Z = 1.14, p = .254. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .033), suggesting that the practical impact of this decline is negligible. In other words, although this subgroup did not see year-to-year progress, the dip in performance from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 for 7C2 could be due to chance rather than any real decline in performance.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 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 3 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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

| **Question** | **Yes / No**  |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?  | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was presented to stakeholders and updated based on the most current year of data that was not impacted by COVID-19 in order to get the most accurate picture of the current level of satisfaction and involvement of parents of students with disabilities. The targets were set to show improvement in each 3-year cycle or sampling group from FFY 2020 through 2025. The stakeholders indicated acceptance of these baselines and targets.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Parent Involvement targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 37.63% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 38.00% | 38.00% | 38.50% | 39.00% | 39.00% |
| Data | 38.04% | 37.63% | 44.42% | 43.48% | 36.60% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 39.00% | 40.00% | 40.00% | 40.00% |

**FFY 2022 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 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,142 | 2,953 | 36.60% | 39.00% | 38.67% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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 reported in the current report was collected using two parent surveys, which were converted to a scannable format. One survey—containing 26 items and a comment section—was prepared and administered to the parents of preschool children (ages 3-5). The other survey— containing 24 items and a comment section—was prepared and administered to parents of school-age children (ages 5-21). Using the Rasch method of data analysis, each parent survey was scored and then the percentage of parent surveys above the “cut off” score (of 600) was computed. A score above the standard (cut-off score) indicates agreement that the child’s LEA facilitated parental engagement as a means of improving the child’s special education services.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

14,197

**Percentage of respondent parents**

20.80%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Response Rate  | 22.71% | 20.80% |

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

To determine representativeness, WVDE/OSE examines the difference in percentage points between the demographic breakdown of survey respondents (based on the student's demographic subgroup reported by the parent/guardian) and the corresponding breakdown of the target group’s demographics (representing all eligible students in that category). Any data that exhibit an absolute difference of more than 3.0 percentage points indicates areas of over- or underrepresentation.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

A comprehensive report prepared by WVDE/OSE's survey vendor, Measurement Incorporated (MI), details the results of the parent involvement survey for this reporting period. Please see the 508-compliant full report entitled “WVDE IDEA Indicator B-8 Parent Survey Final Report 2022-2023” at [https://wvde.us/special-education/family-and-public-partnership/west-virginia-advisory-council-for-the-education-of-exceptional-children/#wv-idea-parent] which includes the methodology and findings.

Respondents were representative in all categories examined with two exceptions. Children with a specific learning disability and those in the low socioeconomic status (SES) category were underrepresented compared to their expected participation percentages (5.7% and 3.6% lower, respectively). Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 in the full report compare demographic data from SY2022-23 survey respondents to WV’s December Child Count data from the corresponding school year in the areas of race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, and socioeconomic status, respectively. Comparing these characteristics indicates how well students from the cohort of local educational agencies (LEA) whose parents/guardians responded to the survey represent the broader population of students with disabilities in those same LEAs.

For more information, please refer to comparisons of the SY 2022-23 survey sample to the corresponding school year’s December Child Count data disaggregated for preschool (Table B-1) and school-age (Table B-2) populations in the Appendix section of the full survey report. MI calculated the 95% confidence intervals for the percent of parents who met the standard (i.e., the percent of parents at or above the standard). These results are summarized by LEA in Table 9 of the full survey report, and are disaggregated by age group in the Appendix (Tables B-3 and B-4).

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

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**

WVDE/OSE will continue to offer surveys through various channels like email, online forms, and paper versions to cater to different preferences and accessibility needs. Other options will be explored, including collaborating with resource teachers, using school newsletters, websites, and parent-teacher conferences to promote the survey and its benefits, sending flyers and information home with students, and utilizing existing school-based social media groups to raise awareness and encourage participation.

In the event of over- or under-representativeness with respect to any demographic subgroup, statistical weighting will be used to adjust response data to reflect the demographics of children receiving special education services.

WVDE/OSE will continue to analyze and report data by various demographic groups to identify any disparities in response rates or findings, as well as share the methodology and any limitations of the survey and data analysis in public reports. Effectiveness of data collection strategies will continue to be regularly evaluated and adapted as needed.

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The survey collection process involved three different methods.

PAPER: Respondents were provided with a paper copy of the survey, enabling them to complete and return the survey to the survey vendor, Measurement Incorporated (MI) in a postage-paid envelope. This year, a scannable QR code was added to the survey to facilitate parent participation.

ONLINE: Respondents were provided with log-in information to access and complete the survey online. The user-friendly design of the online survey was updated to enhance user experience.

DIRECT EMAIL: Direct emails were sent to parents/guardians for whom email addresses were available. The emails sent to parents contained pertinent instructions and a hyperlink to the survey.

MI closely monitored the survey dissemination process through data monitoring procedures. MI provided timely and ongoing communication to the WVDE staff throughout the survey administration process. In the analysis phase of the project, MI examined the data for representativeness on key demographic variables, i.e., race/ethnicity, age group, gender, disability, and SES (SES categorization was based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch-FRPL). These results allow WVDE to make determinations about how well the findings can be generalized to the overall population of children receiving special education services.

Children in the low SES subgroup were underrepresented in the survey data by 3.6%, an absolute improvement of 3.5% over the previous FFY’s results. Additional outreach methods will be considered, including collaboration with resource teachers, leveraging school communication channels (newsletters, websites, parent-teacher conferences), distributing flyers with students, and utilizing existing school-based social media groups for awareness and participation promotion.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

RESPONSE RATE

With a total of 14,197 surveys delivered, at a 95% confidence level and a 3% margin of error, the minimum sample size required is 993, which is equivalent to a 6.99% overall response rate. A total of 2,953 surveys were returned from both preschool and school age groups, resulting in a response rate of 20.8%. Compared to three years ago when these LEAs were last surveyed (SY 2019-20), the overall response rate this year dropped by 5.1%. The response rate for the preschool parent survey decreased by 2.3%, and the response rate for the school age parent survey decreased by 5.3%. Table 2 in the full survey report provides a detailed comparison of these changes. WVDE/OSE's analysis revealed a statistically significant decline in overall response rates for this cohort of LEAs from SY 2019-20 to SY 2022-23 (Z = 9.99, p < .001); however, the very small effect size suggests that the practical impact of this decline is negligible (Cohen’s h = .12).

NONRESPONSE BIAS

Regarding representativeness, children with specific learning disabilities and those in the low SES category were underrepresented by more than 3.0 percentage points compared to their expected participation percentages (5.7% and 3.6% lower, respectively).To determine whether the specific learning disabilities subgroup differed from other disability subgroups in reported parent satisfaction, the proportion of parents of children with specific learning disabilities whose responses indicated a level of agreement at or above the standard was compared to the proportion of parents of children with all other disabilities whose responses also indicated a level of agreement at or above the standard. This analysis revealed a statistically insignificant difference in overall parent satisfaction between parents of children with specific learning disabilities (38.9%) and all other parents of children with disabilities (38.6%), Z = 0.15, p = .881. Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .01), suggesting that the practical impact of this difference is negligible. A similar analysis was conducted for survey responses of parents of children eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL) (38.6%), which is the proxy for low SES, and parents of children not eligible for FRPL (38.8%). Comparable results were obtained, suggesting a statistically insignificant difference in overall parent satisfaction (Z = 0.11, p = .914) with a minimal practical impact (Cohen’s h = .004).

To ensure survey results accurately reflect the whole population, adjustments were made for differences in the response rates of different groups. This was addressed with “nonresponse weighting,” a two-step statistical method involving: (1) determining expected respondent numbers per group based on population data, and (2) adjusting individual response weights for better population representation. After applying this weighting, the percentages of parents satisfied with the program were slightly different with disability category as the variable of interest (38.7% unweighted results; 38.2% weighted results) but remained unchanged for parents of children in different SES groups (38.7%). Weighting the results by disability category to address nonresponse bias revealed minimal impact on overall parent satisfaction. Unweighted and weighted satisfaction rates were very similar (38.7% and 38.2%, respectively) and showed no statistically significant difference (Z = 0.30, p = .768). Further, the observed effect size is very small (Cohen’s h = .03), suggesting that the practical impact of this difference is negligible.

While there was underrepresentation of parents of students with specific learning disabilities and parents of students eligible for FRPL (i.e., low SES), WVDE/OSE’s analyses showed no statistically significant or practical differences in parent satisfaction levels between these subgroups and all others. This suggests minimal impact from potential nonresponse bias. Statistical weighting further confirmed these results likely reflect the perspectives of the broader parent population.

PROMOTING RESPONSE

In an effort to boost response rates, a multi-pronged approach was used. Parents across the 19 LEAs surveyed received both paper and online survey options, followed by reminder mailings for non-respondents. This was further bolstered by targeted email campaigns, with personalized messages and survey links sent to over 7,000 parents in both preschool and school-age categories. To optimize survey completion, the process was closely monitored through data tracking procedures, ensuring efficient administration and maximizing participation. These combined efforts ultimately led to a significant increase in response rates, with preschool rates reaching 26.1% (from 13.9% in June), school-age rates reaching 20.4% (from 10.1% in June), and combined rates reaching 20.8% for the cohort of LEAs (from 10.4% in June). Rigorous follow-up, including addressing delivery and access issues, coupled with collaboration with LEA directors, were employed in an attempt to increase parent survey participation.

Further, inspecting the distribution of response rates indicated a mean response rate of 20.2% with a standard deviation (SD) of 6.2%. For this distribution 14% would indicate one SD below the mean, and 26.3% would indicate one SD above the mean. Accordingly, in 2023, the response rates of three LEAs were more than one SD above the mean response rate and the response rates of four LEAs were more than one SD below the mean response rate. In addition, Table 4 on page 7 of the full report displays a comparison between 2023 and 2020 (or the last time the same LEAs were sampled), in terms of response rates and Indicator 8 percentages for each of the 19 LEAs surveyed (20 LEAs in 2020).

Please see the 508-compliant full SY 2022-23 report at [https://wvde.us/special-education/family-and-public-partnership/west-virginia-advisory-council-for-the-education-of-exceptional-children/#wv-idea-parent] which includes the methodology and findings.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| 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.**

In a collaborative effort, MI and WVDE/OSE coordinated the details regarding survey administration. WVDE sampled the population of LEAs to provide a representative sample of families to survey. The sample was consistent with the OSEP-approved sampling plan that takes into account disability category, race/ethnicity, region, and LEA size. All parents of students with disabilities in the selected LEAs are surveyed and all LEAs are surveyed at least once within a three-year period.

Each survey was labeled with a code that could be linked to an LEA and the child's demographic data. Each survey packet mailed to a parent contained a survey, an instructional letter, and a postage-paid return envelope addressed to MI. Mailing the completed survey directly to the independent contractor protects parents’ confidentiality. Parents also had the option of completing the survey online. The paper survey mailed to parents included pertinent instructions (i.e., log-in information and a username) to allow online participation. Direct emails containing the survey’s hyperlink were also sent to a portion of the sample recipients for whom email addresses were available (372 preschool parents and 6,655 school-age parents).

The OSEP-approved sampling plan is available at [https://wvde.us/special-education/family-and-public-partnership/west-virginia-advisory-council-for-the-education-of-exceptional-children/#wv-idea-parent] and has not been revised since its initial approval.

Please see the full 508 compliant survey report at [https://wvde.us/special-education/family-and-public-partnership/west-virginia-advisory-council-for-the-education-of-exceptional-children/#wv-idea-parent] which includes procedures, methodology, and validity.

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

A revised sampling plan that will be implemented beginning SY 2023-24 school year accounting for redistribution of sampling groups using updated child count data and inclusion of newly approved charter schools will be submitted to OSEP for approval.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services using the metric of +/- 3%. However, in its narrative, the State reported "This year, MI included an analysis for internal state review of the representativeness of surveys based on socio-economic status for the first time and was the only sub-category that included the under-representation of more than 3.0% of the eligible population." In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR**

This FFY 2022 SPP/APR reports that the FFY 2022 data are not fully representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services; however, statistical weighting procedures were implemented to correct for any underrepresentation and the difference between the unweighted and weighted results was negligible. Additional outreach methods will be considered to address this issue, including collaboration with special education teachers, leveraging school communication channels (newsletters, websites, parent-teacher conferences), distributing flyers with students, and utilizing existing school-based social media groups for awareness and participation promotion. An analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services is provided in the field under the prompt that begins with “Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents…”. For a comprehensive overview of this indicator for FFY 2022, please refer to the “Indicator 8: Parent Involvement” narratives above.

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 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 response data 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 the reporting year, 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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2021 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2022 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.**

26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 33 | 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).**

“DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION” DEFINITION

WVDE/OSE defines "disproportionate representation" as a risk ratio of 3.0 or greater (overrepresentation) for any given year (every one year). When disproportionate representation is identified in an LEA, WVDE/OSE determines whether the disproportionate representation is the result of inappropriate identification by reviewing policies, practices, and procedures as submitted by the LEA. Data for each LEA are analyzed for all racial/ethnic groups.

CALCULATING “DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION”

WVDE/OSE calculates a risk ratio for each of the seven racial/ethnic categories within each LEA, using data from the SY 2022-23 December Child Count file of students 5 (in K) through 21, and data from the SY 2022-23 October Enrollment file of students in grades K through 12. To be included in the analysis, an LEA must have at least 10 students with disabilities (cell size) and at least 30 students in overall enrollment (n-size) within the specific racial/ethnic group. The group's risk is then compared to either the LEA or state risk for all other students. For the LEA comparison group to be used, it must also meet the minimum cell (10) and n (30) sizes within its "all other" racial/ethnic category; otherwise, the statewide comparison group risk is used.

**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.**

There was no disproportionate representation identified.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

A diverse group of stakeholders was presented with the proposed change to calculation methodology in December 2022. The rationale of aligning indicators 9 and 10 with significant disproportionality calculations to increase awareness and understanding of disproportionate representation and as a means to provide early intervention for the districts identified before being determined to be significantly disproportionate was also explained. There was clarification requested on the minimum n and cell sizes, which also changed, and subsequently, the group supported using the new measurement. The baseline was revised accordingly.

All LEAs are eligible for inclusion in the analysis with the exception of the state-operated WV Schools for the Deaf and Blind, and WV Schools for Diversion and Transition (institutional education programs across the state). Given the specialized nature of these two (2) LEAs, they are excluded from the analysis as they do not identify students for special education services.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the State's FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must revise its baseline if a new calculation methodology is used to report data for this indicator.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

The required revision has been made, and an explanation is provided as additional information for this indicator.

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 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 section 618 data for the reporting year, 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). 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 specific disability categories 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2021 | 2.56% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.56% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2022 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.**

26

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 0 | 33 | 2.56% | 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).**

“DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION” DEFINITION

WVDE/OSE defines "disproportionate representation" as a risk ratio of 3.0 or greater (overrepresentation) for any given year (every one year). When disproportionate representation is identified in an LEA, WVDE/OSE determines if the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification by reviewing policies, practices, and procedures as submitted by the LEA. Data for each LEA are analyzed for all racial/ethnic groups and the six required disability categories.

CALCULATING “DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION”

WVDE/OSE calculates a risk ratio for each of the seven racial/ethnic categories in each of the six required disability categories within each LEA using data from the SY 2022-23 December Child Count file of students 5 (in K) through 21, and data from the SY 2022-23 October Enrollment file of students in grades K through 12. To be included in the analysis, an LEA must have at least 10 students in one or more of the particular disability categories (cell size) and at least 30 students in overall enrollment (n-size) within the specific racial/ethnic group. The group's risk is then compared to either the LEA or state risk for all other students. For the LEA comparison group to be used, it must also meet the minimum cell (10) and n (30) sizes within its "all other" racial/ethnic category; otherwise, the statewide comparison group risk is used.

**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.**

Following the identification of disproportionate representation in one (1) LEA for a single racial/ethnic group in one (1) specific disability category, a subsequent comprehensive file review process was conducted to assess the LEA’s adherence to West Virginia Board of Education (WVBE) Policy 2419: Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities, particularly within the pre-referral and intervention process, multidisciplinary evaluation process, and eligibility determination process, to determine potential factors contributing to the observed disproportionate representation.

Selection of the ten (10) student files that were reviewed followed a pre-defined protocol, ensuring a representative sample from diverse school settings. Files with recent eligibility committee determinations (initial or reevaluation) were prioritized. Redundancy was avoided by excluding files reviewed in a previous self-assessment cycle.

Each selected file was thoroughly examined using a dedicated checklist aligned with WVBE Policy 2419 [https://wvde.us/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/9\_10\_District\_File\_Review\_Checklists.pdf]. The checklist items focus on specific aspects of the student's special education identification and eligibility process, including the implementation of interventions prior to referral for evaluation if applicable, the membership and practices of the multidisciplinary evaluation team, and the rationale and evidence supporting the eligibility determination. Each item received a "yes" or "no" response, accompanied by clear documentation of supporting evidence.

The review findings indicated that the one (1) LEA consistently followed prescribed policies and procedures outlined in WVBE Policy 2419 throughout the pre-referral, evaluation, and eligibility stages. Therefore, the disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in a specific disability category in the one (1) LEA identified was not a result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

A diverse group of stakeholders was presented with the proposed change to calculation methodology in December 2022. The rationale of aligning indicators 9 and 10 with significant disproportionality calculations to increase awareness and understanding of disproportionate representation and as a means to provide early intervention for the districts identified before being determined to be significantly disproportionate was also explained. There was clarification requested on the minimum n and cell sizes, which also changed, and subsequently, the group supported using the new measurement. The baseline was revised accordingly.

All LEAs are eligible for inclusion in the analysis with the exception of the state-operated WV Schools for the Deaf and Blind, and WV Schools for Diversion and Transition (institutional education programs across the state). Given the specialized nature of these LEAs, they are excluded from the analysis as they do not identify students for special education services.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

A subsequent internal review of statewide data indicated that the FFY 2021 submission erroneously identified one (1) LEA with disproportionate representation and noncompliance with regulatory requirements when in fact there were zero (0) LEAs identified with disproportionate representation and noncompliance with regulatory requirements. WVDE/OSE takes full responsibility for the data inconsistencies and have indicated above that previously reported data were corrected within one year as a result of the internal review.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

A subsequent internal review of statewide data indicated that the FFY 2021 submission erroneously identified one LEA with disproportionate representation and noncompliance with regulatory requirements when in fact there were zero (0) LEAs identified with disproportionate representation and noncompliance with regulatory requirements. WVDE/OSE takes full responsibility for the data inconsistencies. As a result of the internal review indicating that the one (1) LEA was not identified with disproportionate representation and noncompliance with regulatory requirements, zero (0) individual cases were identified as needing correction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the State's FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must revise its baseline if a new calculation methodology is used to report data for this indicator.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the district identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

The required baseline revision has been made, and an explanation is provided as additional information for this indicator.

A subsequent internal review of statewide data indicated that the FFY 2021 submission erroneously identified one (1) LEA with disproportionate representation and noncompliance with regulatory requirements when in fact there were zero (0) LEAs with disproportionate representation and noncompliance with regulatory requirements. WVDE/OSE takes full responsibility for the data inconsistencies and has specifically identified a combination of factors, including the transition to a new methodology, key staff turnover during the reporting period, and an isolated data error that contributed to the reported discrepancy. WVDE/OSE has updated our review process to ensure accurate reporting. Additionally, WVDE/OSE has developed clear guidance documents and reference materials for accurate data analysis and reporting timeframes, implemented comprehensive knowledge and process documentation plans for sustainable and repeatable analysis and reporting (which should also mitigate any problems associated with staff turnover), and established a multi-level review system for data accuracy before reporting.

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 98.62% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.46% | 96.70% | 98.62% | 96.46% | 97.02% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2022 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 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10,734 | 10,274 | 97.02% | 100% | 95.71% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

One (1) LEA was responsible for 66.96% of the 460 initial evaluations in FFY 2022 that were completed outside of the State-established 80-day timeline for reasons not included as allowable exceptions in WVBE Policy 2419: Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities.

Additionally, several LEAs reported challenges in filling diagnostician and school psychologist vacancies due to unforeseen circumstances, while seventeen (17) LEAs experienced turnover in their special education director positions.

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

460

**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.**

The range of days beyond West Virginia’s 80 calendar-day timeline when the evaluations were completed was 1- 331 days.

A breakdown of the number and reasons for delayed evaluations follows:
 1 — Ninety Day Face-to-Face meeting exceeded timeline due to documented parent requests to reschedule
 2 — Eligibility Committee reconvened at parent request to consider additional evaluations
 3 — Student medical condition delayed evaluation
12 — Excessive Student Absences
19 — Eligibility Committee meeting exceeded timelines due to documented parent request for rescheduling.
423 — District Error

**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).**

WVBE Policy 2419 establishes a timeline of 80 calendar days by which initial evaluations must be completed.

WVBE Policy 2419 includes the following exceptions to the 80-day timeline:
1. LEAs are closed due to circumstances resulting in a state of emergency determined by the Governor of West Virginia.
2. LEAs are closed due to weather conditions determined by the LEA Superintendent, and no remote learning options are required.
3. Summer break.

In such cases, the timelines are extended directly proportional to the duration of any state of emergency, weather conditions, or summer break.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**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.**

All LEAs are required to enter initial evaluation data into the West Virginia Education Informational System (WVEIS), including the referral date, date consent was received, eligibility due date, eligibility determination date, eligibility status, primary exceptionality (if eligible), and late reason code (if applicable). The Initial Evaluation (INI.EVAL) application within WVEIS summarizes live Child Find data for each LEA and includes seven types of custom reports the SEA and LEA can use for monitoring and review.

All LEAs review initial evaluation data and submit three (3) progress reports through the INI.EVAL application in December, March, and June of each school year. The submitted progress reports are reviewed by SEA staff and feedback is provided to LEAs as appropriate regarding any concerns or missing data.

Each LEA reviews and submits a final report for the previous school year that contains student-level data for initial evaluation consents received from July 1st through June 30th and is submitted for the appropriate SPP/APR reporting period.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In FFY 2022, one (1) LEA was responsible for two-thirds of the 460 initial evaluations completed outside the 80-day timeline. Excluding this LEA, the statewide compliance rate for timely initial evaluations would have been 98.51% and although not meeting target slippage would not have occurred.

This one (1) LEA is the same LEA reported with longstanding noncompliance and actions taken by WVDE/OSE are described below.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 22 | 21 | 0 | 1 |

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Subsequent reviews of updated data for each LEA identified with noncompliance were conducted through quarterly monitoring using the statewide initial evaluation application in WVEIS. Technical assistance and feedback were provided to each LEA after the quarterly reviews of new data until such time as the LEA meets 100% compliance with regard to timelines for initial evaluations for a three-month period. WVDE/OSE verification of compliance was followed by written notification to the LEA that the findings of noncompliance have been corrected.

WVDE/OSE has verified that twenty-one (21) of the twenty-two (22) LEAs are now implementing regulatory requirements of 100% compliance and that there are no systemic issues.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

WVDE/OSE verified through a review of updated data collected through WVEIS that, although late, each of the 321 individual cases of noncompliance for initial evaluations were corrected. Verification of corrections included completion of the initial evaluation prior to the end of the school year, unless the student unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 which was superseded by OSEP QA 23-01).

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

The one (1) remaining LEA received a written notification of noncompliance in SY 2022-23 that contained information on the OSEP-required target, a description of the compliance criteria, a required corrective action plan, and best practice recommendations to improve compliance. This notification also identified sanctions that could be imposed should the LEA continue to be noncompliant in meeting initial evaluation timelines, including the potential for redirection of funds from their SY 2024-25 IDEA allocation to address ongoing noncompliance issues.

Due to persistent noncompliance regarding Indicator 11, LEA staff involved in the pre-referral process are required to attend WVDE/OSE training on the initial evaluation process. The LEA will also be subject to a focus monitoring on-site visit, a collaborative root cause analysis and needs assessment facilitated by WVDE/OSE.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FFY 2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

In FFY 2021 SPP/APR, in response to "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020", the narrative WVDE/OSE provided erroneously reported verification of correction for 18 out of 20 LEAs, when the data chart showed 19 out of 20 LEAs as meeting the regulatory requirements for initial evaluations. As a result of this clerical error, the table above continues to reflect that two (2) findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were not yet verified as corrected as of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, rather than one (1) finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020.

WVDE/OSE takes full responsibility for the data inconsistency between what was entered in the table and what was reported in the narrative, and affirms that the 19 findings of noncompliance, as entered in the chart in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, were verified as corrected within one year through subsequent reviews of updated data for each LEA identified with noncompliance in FFY 2020. These reviews were conducted through quarterly monitoring using the statewide initial evaluation application in WVEIS. Technical assistance and feedback were provided to each LEA after the quarterly reviews of new data until such time as the LEA meets 100% compliance with regard to timelines for initial evaluations for a three-month period. WVDE/OSE verification of compliance was followed by written notification to the LEA that the findings of noncompliance have been corrected.

WVDE/OSE verified that nineteen (19) of the twenty (20) LEAs reported in FFY 2020 were now implementing regulatory requirements of 100% compliance and that there are no systemic issues.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

WVDE/OSE verified through a review of updated data collected through WVEIS that, although late, each of the 270 individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for initial evaluations were corrected. Verification of corrections included completion of the initial evaluation prior to the end of the school year, unless the student unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 which was superseded by OSEP FAQ 23-01).

**FFY 2020**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

As indicated in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the LEA that continued to demonstrate noncompliance received additional monitoring for this indicator for SY 2022-23 and received intensified technical assistance and support in accordance with the state monitoring and support system. Due to consistent long-standing noncompliance, this LEA has been engaged in multiple years of monitoring and review for indicator 11. See current information for FFY 2022 above.

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, when reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

WVDE/OSE has responded to the required actions regarding the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, the status of each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, and the specific actions that were taken to verify these corrections in the indicator narratives above.

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, and the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: 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**

 a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

 b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

 c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

 d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

 e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

 f. # 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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 98.16% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 98.16% | 97.86% | 98.83% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 1,202 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 203 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 845 |
| 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.  | 92 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 53 |
| 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 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 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. | 845 | 854 | 98.83% | 100% | 98.95% | Did not meet 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**

9

**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.**

WV does not have option 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."

The range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed is between 21 – 248 days.

Recruitment issues and lack of school personnel posed challenges for transitions in three (3) LEAs: One of the LEAs has implemented new procedures and hired staff to address these issues, while the other two (2) LEAs are developing strategies to prevent future service delays due to personnel limitations.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**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.**

The lead agency for Part C, WV Birth to Three (WVBTT), is the WV Department of Health. As a result, the data system for each organization is distinct and separate. During SY 2015-16, the effective data collection plan continued to be implemented by WVBTT, WVDE, and local districts. WVDE continues to require districts to maintain referral dates, referral sources, eligibility status, exceptionality, eligibility dates, and IEP dates for all students within the WVEIS electronic student record system. Districts are contacted individually to verify and complete missing information as needed. Data are extracted at least annually and examined to verify compliance with transition requirements. Additionally, Child Notification Forms, containing the allowable demographic information, were sent to each school district six months prior to the child turning three. Procedures require the LEA representative to contact the family to discuss potential services. The LEA representative then completed the individual child forms and returned them to the WVDE for data entry, verification, and follow-up.

WVBTT and WVDE collaborated in data comparison and tracking to ensure all students referred by WVBTT were followed, and LEAs were in compliance with timelines. Also, to assist in meeting the Part C regulations for transition timelines for timely reporting, the WVDE in conjunction with WV BTT developed an online e-mail portal that allows for the Child Notification form to be uploaded and sent directly to the state and local educational agency by the Regional Administrative Unit (RAU) providers. The RAUs are responsible for sending the Child Notification for those children whose initial eligibility occurs 150 days or closer to the third birthday. The form indicates if the notification is less than 45 days prior to the child’s third birthday. An additional new form was added for children transferring and families moving out of the district to better assist LEAs in keeping track of families and children that may potentially be eligible for a transition from Part C services. These processes and procedures are still being utilized as a part of the data collection for transition.

The Revised Transition Procedures from Part C to Part B were implemented in 2020 and are reviewed annually. The procedures are posted on the WV Birth to Three Website [http://www.wvdhhr.org/birth23/trans\_proc/Transition\_Procedures\_C\_B.pdf ].

The Question-and-Answer document was distributed regarding the Child Find Notification process. The document was distributed to WVBTT and LEA special education directors to clarify responsibilities regarding this process. LEAs were contacted to investigate the reasons why timelines are not being met and to ascertain whether systemic issues were causing delays in timelines and if technical assistance is needed. As part of the WV Birth to Three Interagency Advisory Committee (ICC), the transition committee completed a transition guidance booklet for families. The guidance booklet is available for distribution to families and professionals [http://www.wvdhhr.org/birth23/wvbtt\_trans\_flip/#p=1].

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

An increase in children deemed ineligible or already receiving special education services was observed this year alongside a rise in parental requests for transition services. This suggests a normalization of preschool enrollment following COVID-19 concerns and the optional nature of preschool attendance. Additionally, rates of parental consent slightly increased.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Subsequent reviews of updated data for LEAs identified with noncompliance were conducted through a review of monthly submission of individual child forms by each LEA. Technical assistance and feedback were provided to each LEA after the quarterly reviews of new data until such time as the LEA meets 100% compliance with regard to timelines for at least three consecutive months. WVDE/OSE verification of compliance was followed by written notification to the LEA that the findings of noncompliance have been corrected.

WVDE/OSE has verified that each of the three (3) LEAs identified in FFY 2021 are now implementing regulatory requirements of 100% compliance and that there are no systemic issues.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

To verify that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, the LEAs identified as having noncompliance were required to submit the names of each of the students reported as late (IEP held beyond the 3rd birthday), and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP were completed.

WVDE/OSE verified through a review of updated data collected through WVEIS that, although late, each of the nine (9) individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 received a Part B evaluation and, if eligible, an IEP was implemented within one year of notification of noncompliance, unless the student unless the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA (consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 which was superseded by OSEP FAQ 23-01).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

WVDE/OSE has reported the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator and the specific actions that were taken in the indicator narratives above.

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

 (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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 99.84% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.15% | 99.49% | 99.84% | 99.84% | 71.99% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2022 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 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 459 | 643 | 71.99% | 100% | 71.38% | Did not meet 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.**

WVDE/OSE collects data as described in the IDEA Part B Programmatic Monitoring Procedures [https://wvde.us/special-education/policies-and-compliance/monitoring-and-compliance/#fusion-tab-specialeducationmonitoring]. These procedures include implementation of a tiered system of accountability and support to ensure all LEAs meet the requirements of IDEA. Levels of monitoring that could produce data for this indicator include:

\* Cyclical Monitoring (Universal) occurs on a four-year rotation to ensure that every LEA receives an on-site visit at least once every four years.

\* Differentiated Monitoring (Universal) determines an LEA’s risk of non-compliance for both programmatic and fiscal factors.

\* Risk-Based Monitoring (Targeted) LEAs deemed to be at-risk receive additional monitoring activities and support to identify root causes and solutions for reducing risk factors.

\* Focused Monitoring (Intensive) is a process where the LEA may receive an on-site visit based on identified need, or information collected from data sources such as long-standing non-compliance, LEA determinations, parent calls, or specific issues brought to the attention fof the WVDE/OSE (this process can occur concurrently with any other monitoring activity or as an independent activity); and

\* Special Circumstance Reviews (Intensive) are conducted for LEAs identified as needing assistance or intervention in the state accountability system to ensure LEAs are providing FAPE to students with disabilities in West Virginia.

The most common source of data for Indicator 13 secondary transition comes through the state’s cyclical monitoring process which follows the school year calendar and ensures that every LEA receives an on-site visit at least once every four years. Using the statewide online IEP system, and based on the student population for each LEA, the WVDE/OSE randomly reviews IEP/Transition plans for students ages 14-21 with an IEP. Transition plans are reviewed to verify that they follow the transition file review checklist [https://wvde.us/special-education/policies-and-compliance/monitoring-and-compliance/#fusion-tab-specialeducationmonitoring] and include verification that an annual IEP/transition meeting took place within the past 365 days; and that documentation exists, either in the statewide online IEP system or in the LEA permanent special education files, as evidence that:

\* When appropriate, the parent or adult student provided permission to invite outside agencies, and if consent is obtained, outside agencies that would be likely to provide or pay for transition services, including pre-employment transition services, were invited (TR1 & TR2).

\* There are measurable postsecondary goals for education/training, employment, and when appropriate independent living (TR3, TR4, & TR5).

\* Postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessments (TR6).

\* Transition services include courses of study that will enable the student to meet postsecondary goals (TR7).

\* The student was invited to the meeting (TR8).

\* There are annual goals related to the student’s transition services and needs (TR9).

\* There are transition services in the IEP that will reasonably enable the student to meet their post-secondary goals (TR10).

If the LEA is determined to be noncompliant in any single area listed above, the entire transition plan is marked as non-compliant. LEAs are notified in writing of their noncompliance and a timeline (per OSEP memo 09-02 which was superseded by OSEP QA 23-01) provided that requires the correction of all individual instances of non-compliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from notification of noncompliance. In addition, LEA staff responsible for writing secondary transition plans must participate in technical assistance and support provided by WVDE/OSE to ensure that they are meeting the requirements of IDEA for students ages 14-21. WVDE/OSE then conducts additional reviews of updated data until the LEA meets 100% compliance; updated data are obtained through the state’s online IEP system or an on-site visit. Until the LEA has been cleared for individual and systemic issues of non-compliance, they may be subject to monitoring activities outside of cyclical monitoring for multiple years to ensure they are meeting the requirements of IDEA regarding secondary transition plans.

Percent Compliance = [(total number of student transition plans reviewed and deemed complaint) divided by (total number of student transition plans reviewed during the school year)] x 100. This same formula applies to calculating individual LEA compliance, as well as the statewide calculation used for SPP/APR reporting purposes.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?  | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | YES |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator | 14 |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

WVDE/OSE utilizes the following to provide LEAs with focused professional development, technical assistance, and support for improving results for secondary transition planning and student outcomes for postschool opportunities.

OSEP-FUNDED TA CENTERS
WVDE/OSE continues to work with NTACT:C to identify resources that will align transition services (including pre-ETS) for improved SEA support for school staff and families as they navigate the transition planning process. NTACT:C also facilitates monthly virtual meetings between WVDE and the WV Division of Rehabilitation Services (WVDRS) to collaborate on transition service delivery and the development of common training opportunities for LEAs. WVDE/OSE has also been working with IDC/Westat, NCSI/WestEd and NTACT:C to revise its procedures for more efficient data collection and analysis intended to improve compliance for this indicator at the local level.

WEBSITE RESOURCES
In Fall of 2022, WVDE/OSE provided updated resources for secondary transition on its website [https://wvde.us/special-education/wv-guideposts-to-graduation/] to enable school staff easier access to information on secondary transition requirements. In addition, WVDE produced a short training video on how to use the WVDRS website called PathwaysWV.org which contains a collection of resources and tools to help students with disabilities through the journey from youth to adulthood. WVDE/OSE also created a list of statewide partnerships for LEAs to consider when determining appropriate outside agencies to be invited to IEP transition meetings.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE and SUPPORT
WVDE/OSE purchased an evidence-based course called "Writing High-Quality Secondary Transition Plans" from an OSEP-funded TA center. This self-paced course is available to anyone with a WVDE email address and is housed on the state's CANVAS platform. To promote public transparency of the course contents, companion resources were developed from the materials within this course and are available in the secondary transition section of the WV Guideposts to Graduation website [link provided in previous paragraph]. This course includes content training on the following topics: Federal Regulations and Transition Services; Required components of the Transition Plan, Conducting Transition Assessments and Organizing the Data; Present Levels of Performance Requirements; Employability Skills; Writing Measurable Postsecondary Goals; Transition Services and Courses of Study; and Writing Annual Transition Goals. This course is available to all LEA staff as universal TA but is required as targeted TA when an LEA has been identified as not meeting IDEA requirements for secondary transition planning. When LEA staff are required to complete this course as part of a corrective action plan, they must also provide evidence that all LEA staff who write transition plans are meeting the requirements of IDEA. This can be accomplished through the end-of-course summative assessment (quiz) which must be passed with a grade of 80% or better to obtain a certificate of completion. These certificates are collected by the LEA special education director and made available to WVDE/OSE as verification that staff are appropriately trained to write compliant secondary transition plans and that the LEA does not have systemic issues of noncompliance related to transition planning. WVDE/OSE also conducts 1:1 TA with LEAs via phone, Teams meetings, and provision of on-site professional development.

ALIGNMENT WITH SSIP
In addition to the CANVAS course described above, the SSIP monthly Community of Practice for SY 2023-24 focuses on the required components of secondary transition planning in IDEA and the collaboration of transition service delivery with outside agencies. Participation in the CoP is mandatory for all LEAs who do not meet the compliance requirements for indicator 13. This requirement will ensure that all LEAs in West Virginia have the same foundations and support for writing high quality transition plans.

WVDE/OSE will continue to seek stakeholder input on the effectiveness of these resources and the need for development of additional tools.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

Compliance with specific IDEA regulatory requirements for transition planning was verified in each of the twenty (20) LEAs by WVDE/OSE based on a review of updated data from IEPs of transition-aged students. This data was subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or the WV statewide online IEP system. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 (and the new OSEP QA 23-01), each of the twenty (20) LEAs identified in FFY 2021 as noncompliant have corrected each individual instance of noncompliance, and the subsequent updated review of data shows that each LEA is implementing student transition plans with 100% compliance. The WVDE/OSE review has determined that there are no systemic issues with transition planning in each of the twenty (20) LEAs identified as noncompliant in FFY 2021.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

Each of the 172 individual student files identified in FFY 2021 as noncompliant was corrected and verification was attained through a desk audit review of new data obtained through the WV statewide online IEP system or during an on-site visit to the LEA. Individual cases of noncompliance were reviewed for each of the required components of transition planning unless the student was no longer in the jurisdiction of the noncompliant LEA. Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 (and the new OSEP QA 23-01) WVDE/OSE determined that each of the 172 noncompliant student files have been corrected within one year of identification and that each LEA is now implementing student transition plans with 100% compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

WVDE/OSE has reported the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for the indicator in the narrative above.

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

C. 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**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 must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 19.00% | 20.00% | 21.00% | 19.03% | 20.03% |
| A | 19.49% | Data | 16.42% | 18.03% | 19.86% | 10.11% | 18.30% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 53.00% | 54.00% | 55.00% | 47.69% | 49.69% |
| B | 48.84% | Data | 58.62% | 45.69% | 44.97% | 27.01% | 51.16% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% | 71.01% | 71.51% |
| C | 63.57% | Data | 69.31% | 70.51% | 68.42% | 41.49% | 74.58% |

**FFY 2021 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 21.03% | 22.03% | 23.03% | 24.03% |
| Target B >= | 51.69% | 53.69% | 55.69% | 57.69% |
| Target C >= | 72.01% | 72.51% | 73.01% | 73.51% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Post-School Outcomes targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 2,508 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 1,904 |
| Response Rate | 75.92% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 314 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 716 |
| 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) | 70 |
| 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). | 321 |

| **Measure** | **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 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 314 | 1,904 | 18.30% | 21.03% | 16.49% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 1,030 | 1,904 | 51.16% | 51.69% | 54.10% | 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) | 1,421 | 1,904 | 74.58% | 72.01% | 74.63% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | A West Virginia Center on Budget and Policy analysis indicated a 14% decline in state funding for institutions of higher education (IHE) in West Virginia from 2013 to 2020. During the same period, there has been a 33% increase in average tuition and fees in the state. The consistent rise in tuition and fees, particularly for four-year public colleges in West Virginia, presents an additional obstacle to higher education enrollment for all high school graduates, with a particular impact on youth with disabilities.Data from the West Virginia High Education Policy Commission suggests that there has been a steady decline in the overall enrollment for all students in public IHEs over the past decade, with SY 2022-23 having the lowest enrollment numbers of the available trend data. Total enrollment in public four-year IHEs for SY 2022-23 was the lowest since SY 2013-14; two-year IHEs have also seen a similar downward trend. Although the enrollment numbers for two-year IHEs in SY 2022-23 (12,915) are slightly higher than SY 2021-22 (12,764), it is still well below pre-pandemic levels of enrollment (SY 2019-20; 19,350). Another possible reason for a decrease in the number of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education during SY 2022-23 is the COVID-19 pandemic, which has affected the access and affordability of higher education for many students with disabilities who were preparing to enter postsecondary education. Sources: [https://www.wvhepc.edu/resources/data-and-publication-center/data-center-enrollment/] [https://wvpolicy.org/disinvestment-in-higher-education-continues-to-hurt-west-virginias-future/] |

**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.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Response Rate  | 63.26% | 75.92% |

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

To determine representativeness, WVDE/SE compares the percentage point difference between survey respondents and the students who exited in SY 2021-22. Any data that exhibit an absolute difference of more than 3.0 percentage points indicates areas of over- or underrepresentation.

**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. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

WVDE/OSE performed analyses to measure the representativeness of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school who responded to the One-Year Follow-Up Survey (the measurement tool used for Indicator 14). To determine representativeness, WVDE/OSE compares the percentage point difference between survey respondents and the students who exited in SY 2021-22. Any data that exhibit an absolute difference of more than 3.0 percentage points indicates areas of over- or underrepresentation. The following results indicate the survey responses are representative of all youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school during SY 2021-22.

Among youth of differing race/ethnicities, survey respondents were representative of their peers. While racial and ethnic diversity is increasing, West Virginia remains relatively homogeneous. WV’s student body is predominantly “White” (88.59%), followed by “Two or More Races” (4.31%) and “Black or African American” (4.11%). All race/ethnicity groups were within the -/+3.0% margin (range: -0.57 — 0.95).

All exceptionalities were adequately represented in the response data and each category was within the +/-3% margin (range: -0.23 — 0.24) as compared to the distribution of disability categories across all students who exited during SY 2021-22. The emotional disturbance category was underrepresented by only 0.23%, an absolute improvement of 0.59% over the previous FFY’s results.

Representativeness by exit type was examined for those exiting with a regular diploma, with an alternate diploma, reaching the maximum age of 21, and for youth who dropped out. Each exit type was within the +/-3% margin (range: -1.54 — 1.49). Youth who graduated with a regular diploma were minimally overrepresented in the survey data by 1.49%, an absolute improvement of 1.65% over the previous FFY’s results, while those who dropped out of school were underrepresented by only 1.54%, an absolute improvement of 1.49% over the previous FFY’s results.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

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

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

WVDE/OSE will continue to work with LEAs to support the collection of representative survey data. Strategies include:
- adding language to the student’s Summary of Performance document regarding the One Year Follow-Up Exit Survey,
- providing LEAs with additional guidance on notifying students who drop out (and their families) that a survey will be available to them one year after they leave school,
- asking students (and their families) for their current contact information at the time of exiting,
- inventive/resourceful ways to locate students (or their families) after they leave public school,
- reminders and technical assistance from WVDE/OSE on how to review students who have yet to respond to the survey, and
- emphasizing/encouraging responses from groups that were determined to be less likely to respond.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The response rate of 75.92% proves large enough to be representative of the SY 2021-22 cohort when examining the demographic characteristics of race/ethnicity, exit reason, and primary exceptionality. With a survey-eligible population of 2508, at a 95% confidence level, and a 3% margin of error, the minimum sample size required is 749, which is equivalent to a 29.86% overall response rate. The current rate is more than double that level. Further, the response rate increased by 12.66% compared to the FFY 2021 data.

All demographic subgroups reported in the survey were adequately represented, with none exhibiting underrepresentation. The proportion of respondents in each subgroup differed by no more than 3% from the corresponding target population, ensuring a balanced representation across all categories. Because there was no underrepresentation in one or more demographic subgroups consistent with WV’s metric for determining representativeness, nonresponse bias was not identified in the survey data with respect to the demographic subgroups examined.

The recently revised LEA Determination methodology in WV retains the ability to earn a point for an overall minimum response rate from the previous methodology, but now requires a minimum response rate for an LEA to be eligible for outcome-based points for Indicator 14. This revision incentivizes comprehensive data collection to ensure LEAs maintain sufficient response rates so that WVDE/OSE obtains representative survey data year after year.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | NO |
| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| Was a survey used?  | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | YES |
| If yes, attach a copy of the survey | SPP-APR\_FFY-2022\_One-Year-Follow-Up-Survey\_Accessible |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

CHANGES TO THE SURVEY
— The term "Standard diploma" was updated to "Regular diploma" in the survey to align with federal language. Additionally, "County" was replaced with "Local Educational Agency (LEA)" to be inclusive of public charter schools and other non-county LEAs.
— The "race/ethnicity" item was omitted since these data are already captured in WV's student information system and mapped to the survey responses based on the student ID number during analysis.
— The survey question regarding the impact of COVID-19 on postsecondary plans was removed, given the widespread lifting of pandemic restrictions at the state and national levels.
— Several other minor edits were made to enhance overall clarity.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS
Based upon the data regarding declining enrollment in IHEs for students in West Virginia, WVDE/OSE may engage stakeholders to consider revising targets to better reflect the changing landscape for postsecondary opportunities. In addition, WVDE/OSE may look at potential alignment with the SSIP work for improving postsecondary opportunities.

Source: [https://www.wvhepc.edu/resources/data-and-publication-center/data-center-enrollment/]

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

# 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 (E*MAPS*)).

**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 and targets 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 8 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 8 |

**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**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was presented to stakeholders and updated based on the most current year of data that was not impacted by COVID-19 in order to get the most accurate picture of the number of resolution sessions and their efforts to resolve disputes fairly. The targets were set to maintain a slight increase from 75% each year from FFY 2020 through 2025. This target takes into consideration the low number of resolution sessions handled by the state most years. The stakeholders indicated acceptance of this baseline and targets were set to 75%, but the targets were revised based on feedback from OSEP.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Resolution Sessions targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is always open to hearing and addressing any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets. We believe that fostering open communication and valuing the perspectives of all involved parties is essential for achieving our goals.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 75.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 76.00% | 76.50% |
| Data | 90.00% | 90.00% | 75.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 77.00% | 77.50% | 78.00% | 78.50% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | 8 | 100.00% | 77.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 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 (E*MAPS*)).

**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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1 Mediations held | 8 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 3 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 3 |

**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**

INITIAL TARGET SETTING

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was presented to stakeholders and updated based on the most current year of data that was not impacted by COVID-19 in order to get the most accurate picture of the number of mediations and their efforts to resolve disputes fairly. The targets were set to maintain a slight increase from 75% each year from FFY 2020 through 2025. This target takes into consideration the low number of mediations handled by the state most years. The stakeholders indicated acceptance of this baseline and targets were set to 75%, but the targets were revised based on feedback from OSEP.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Resolution Sessions targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 57.14% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 58.00% |  |
| Data | 75.00% | 57.14% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 59.00% | 59.50% | 60.00% | 60.50% |

**FFY 2022 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 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 3 | 8 | 0.00% | 59.00% | 75.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. 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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

 86% of West Virginia students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma by June 2025.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

https://wvde.us/special-education/wv-guideposts-to-graduation/#navigation - scroll to SSIP Section of this webpage to open theory of action

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 83.21% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **Current Relationship** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | Data must be greater than or equal to the target | 84.71% | 85.21% | 85.71% | 86.21% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2,031 | 2,432 | 84.38% | 84.71% | 83.51% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.**

618 graduation data (file specification FS009)

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

Beginning with FFY 2020, SSIP baseline and target data were aligned with 618 graduation data, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009. Data are presented to stakeholders regularly and feedback/input is sought to guide the next steps in the SSIP work. Stakeholders who attend meetings are provided with a survey link for evaluation purposes. WVDE/OSE analyzes both the effectiveness of stakeholder meetings and considers all comments or next steps suggested by a variety of stakeholders. Although graduation rates are lag data, stakeholders can use the data to inform the development of resources necessary for continuous improvement activities at state and local levels. WVDE/OSE also reviews individual LEA data to improve technical assistance and support to those LEAs who are furthest from graduation target.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

In addition to 618 graduation data, WVDE/OSE reviews data obtained through the implementation of the West Virginia Guideposts to Graduation (WVGtG) work (i.e., the SSIP work in WV) to ensure that students with disabilities are continuing to receive supports and services necessary to graduate with a regular diploma. Data collected in the evaluation plan includes outcome descriptions, responsible parties, measurable performance indicators, data collection sources, and frequency of data collection. The evaluation plan link is provided in the appropriate section below.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

Effective July 2022, WVDE upgraded its student data system known as WVEIS allowing multiple systems to be fully integrated into a single streamlined and integrated data platform. Due to this transition between systems, LEAs were requested to complete their SY2021-22 end-of-year collections as soon as possible after graduation occurred to ensure that all data was certified by superintendents prior to the transition to the new data system. Once the data collection was cleaned and analyzed, it appears there may have been multiple LEAs whose superintendents certified end-of-year data prior to special education directors completing the exit data for the 618 data collection. While this does not necessarily mean that data in the new system was incorrect, the state believes that, although there were challenges to the new system, the discrepancies were not meaningful enough to impact validity and reliability, but rather a timing issue related to certifications.

NOTE: New guidance was developed to clarify the procedures for collecting and certifying special education data. This guidance is expected to improve data quality so that WV will meet graduation targets in FFY2023. [https://wvde.us/special-education/data-and-reporting/], Click the ‘Special Education Data Maintenance and Collection’ toggle to access this guidance called “Maintaining Special Education Data in WVEIS (Fall 2023)”.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State’s ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

Although there were no statewide COVID closures during SY 2021-22, the closures which began in SY 2019-20 continue to impact indicators that are measured using lag data. As the SSIP is measured using Indicator 1 lag data, it is expected that the COVID-19 pandemic could impact the variability of trend data and student learning outcomes for at least one more reporting cycle. Additionally, beginning with SY 2021-2022, the statewide end-of-year data collection that includes exit data for students with disabilities has been a focus of support and training to improve the accuracy of reporting by the LEAs. The WVDE/OSE has been training LEAs to clarify the appropriate state-level enrollment and/or special education exiting codes to use where applicable and provide additional support during the collection itself to improve the validity and reliability of future data collections.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

[https://wvde.us/special-education/wv-guideposts-to-graduation/] Scroll to SSIP Section of this webpage to open evaluation plan.

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

DEDICATED POSITION
WVDE/OSE continues to support the dedicated position for SSIP/Secondary Transition Coordinator. That position has been responsible for the development and coordination of all aspects of the SSIP/WVGtG work reported in this year's submission for indicators 17 and 13.

INTERNAL EVALUATOR
WVDE/OSE continues to support the Research & Evaluation Coordinator position which includes SSIP evaluation activities as part of their responsibilities. The internal evaluator works closely with the SSIP Coordinator and the Part B Data Manager to improve the validity of data collected and analyzed per the evaluation plan. This year, the internal evaluator was able to begin automating the data analysis for the survey data collected.

STATE-LEVEL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
WVDE/OSE established an internal stakeholder team to include individuals whose regular responsibilities have an impact on potentially increasing graduation rates. The goal for this internal stakeholder team is to provide complementary and consistent messaging to support LEAs as they engage in local level systemic improvements. This team believes in a cradle to career philosophy regarding a student's journey toward graduation and meets quarterly throughout the year. Between meetings, this group uses the Office 365 TEAMS platform to expand working relationships and collaborate on the development and dissemination of materials and resources related to improving graduation outcomes for students with disabilities.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT
WVDE/OSE continues to offer a competitive grant opportunity for which all LEAs in the state were eligible to apply. The WVGtG grant opportunity was announced in late May 2023 with submissions due from LEAs by June 30, 2023. The application required LEAs to include measurable goals and activities focused on improving graduation and post-school outcomes for students with disabilities ages 14-21. Additional requirements included a description of how the LEAs would implement evidence-based practices in at least one of the following categories: Educational Supports, Student and Family Engagement, Systemic Improvements, and Transition Services. LEAs were asked to include a proposed budget that could not exceed $50,000. Restrictions to the grant funding included a prohibition on attendance or behavior incentives unrelated to special education services, and all items included in the budget must be allowable under IDEA. Once submitted, all applications were reviewed by a team consisting of at least the IDEA finance coordinator and the SSIP coordinator. To support as many LEAs as possible with funding, a rubric was created to ensure a fair and unbiased review of each application. Grantees were notified in July 2023 with funding available for drawdown in mid-August 2023. Although SSIP participation is optional for LEAs, grantees are required to participate in all SSIP activities.

DIFFERENTIATED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
Universal technical assistance for the SSIP is provided through the WVGtG webpage [https://wvde.us/special-education/wv-guideposts-to-graduation/] and dissemination of resources via the LEA special education director listserv, (e.g., announcements of upcoming deadlines and events). The WVGtG webpage has been designed to provide resources and materials intended to build capacity at the local level, as well as provide general information for the public. It also includes a publicly available survey link to solicit external stakeholder feedback and a dedicated email address to request information, differentiated support and/or technical assistance related to secondary transition services, graduation, drop-out prevention, and post-school outcomes. The survey results go directly to the internal evaluator for analysis and the SSIP/Secondary Transition Coordinator responds to all emails received. In addition, based on LEA determinations, 618 data collections, programmatic monitoring, and other data sources the WVDE Team provides targeted and intensive technical assistance and support through: monthly WVGtG Community of Practice virtual meetings, WVGtG Data Dive / Open Doors Meetings, and individual support requested from WVGtG participants.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

DEDICATED POSITION
The SSIP Coordinator supports LEAs by developing resources, providing technical assistance, and offering professional development opportunities to improve graduation outcomes. The coordinator also represents the State Director of Special Education, as the designee, on multiple interagency teams regarding secondary transition and post school outcomes, including the Developmental Disability Council, Employment First Initiative Task Force, and WV Division of Rehabilitation Services. The SSIP Coordinator collaborates with internal WVDE teams to coordinate support and professional development when appropriate. In July 2023, the SSIP Coordinator presented on the work from this reporting period at the OSEP Leadership Conference, delivering a presentation titled “Top Down, Bottom Up, or Meet in the Middle.” The SSIP Coordinator is able to focus on improving progress toward achieving the SiMR and scaling up the work to include all LEAs in WV.

WV GUIDEPOSTS TO GRADUATION (WVGtG) LOGO
The SSIP uses a specific logo on all resources and presentations to promote name recognition between the SSIP and WVGtG. The logo symbolizes the multiple options and supports necessary for students with disabilities to graduate with a regular high school diploma. The guideposts, facing in opposite directions, represent the multiple pathways toward graduation and preparation for postsecondary outcomes. The circle represents the wraparound supports necessary to get to graduation, which is represented by the mortarboard at the top. The logo and name recognition contribute toward scale-up.

INTERNAL EVALUATOR
The analysis of data received through surveys and 618 data collections is a collaborative effort between the internal evaluator and the SSIP Coordinator. The resulting valid and reliable data collected is displayed to the public through an interactive data dashboard on the WVGtG webpage. The internal evaluator provides quicker access to data that can be used to support scale-up and sustainability of improvement efforts.

STATE-LEVEL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Using Leading by Convening resources, the team engages in assessing the purpose, needs, and resources of different WVDE divisions in relation to supporting graduation with a regular high school diploma. The group developed a vision statement for this work: "This WVGtG team will engage in open, concise, and meaningful internal communication and collaboration resulting in the delivery of consistent, high-quality professional learning and TA to increase the local capacity for preparing students with disabilities for everyday living, employment, education, and/or enlistment." For this reporting period, the team utilized TEAMS platform to provide asynchronous input and feedback on the work of WVGtG as well as engage in small group in person meetings to align this work to other initiatives within the state. This team is crucial in aligning state-level work and ensuring sustainability of improvement efforts at the LEA level.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT
The WVDE/OSE team offered a competitive grant opportunity for which all LEAs in the state were eligible to apply. Grantees were also required to submit a minimum of two progress reports during the grant period that outline what evidence-based practices (EBP) they intend to implement and what EBPs they previously implemented. WVGtG grant applications were received from 37 LEAs requesting funding ranging from $8,400 - $50,000. Although this is the same total number of LEAs as last year, there were 2 new LEAs including 1 public charter school. This year’s average award was $28,121 which is an increase of 26% from the previous year. The total amount of funds provided in this reporting period included a 24.5% increase over the previous reporting cycle. As part of the funding award, LEAs were asked to include considerations for future sustainability/local support for this work and were required to participate in the WVGtG Community of Practice monthly meetings.

DIFFERENTIATED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TA) and WEBPAGE RESOURCES/MATERIALS
[https://wvde.us/special-education/wv-guideposts-to-graduation/]
WVDE/OSE launched a dedicated webpage in August 2022 to support its SSIP and the West Virginia Guideposts to Graduation (WVGtG) initiative. This resource, which is continually updated, offers a consistent message through both public and internal platforms for educators, families, and anyone interested in graduation improvement efforts.

Compared to the previous year, the WVGtG webpage saw a 316% increase in unique pageviews from 2022 to 2023 (414 to 1721). This surge in engagement reflects the webpage's valuable content, organized into seven main sections and an interactive Data Dashboard.

The Data Dashboard empowers users to explore various types of LEA information, including targeted improvement areas, special education data, SSIP participation, graduation rates, and more. Updated periodically throughout the year, it presents data for counties, public charter schools, and non-county LEAs in user-friendly formats. WVDE/OSE regularly updates all resources, verifies external links, and prioritizes family-friendliness on the WVGtG webpage. Since the last report, the webpage has undergone several enhancements:
\* Rearranged information for easier navigation.
\* Expanded libraries of EBPs and secondary transition resources.
\* Enriched student and family engagement section with state advisory panel and PACER links.
\* Added new resources for each required component of transition planning.
\* Posted the WVDE-Division of Rehabilitation Services interagency agreement to clarify respective roles in supporting transition services.
\* Updated the statewide partnerships section to highlight collaborative efforts toward improving graduation outcomes.

These changes, implemented based on stakeholder feedback, demonstrate WVDE/OSE's commitment to transparency and responsiveness in its mission to improve graduation rates for students with disabilities. The WVGtG webpage remains a valuable resource for all stakeholders invested in this work.

In addition to the webpage, differentiated TA and support is provided through the following activities:

The WVGtG Community of Practice (CoP) meets virtually for 90 minutes/month to provide targeted TA. Each monthly meeting includes a presentation on implementation strategies, a spotlight on a specific EBP or webpage resource, and breakout sessions with guiding questions for discussion to improve student outcomes. These CoP meetings are required for LEAs who received funding for SSIP implementation but are open to all who want to participate. Attendance was between 50 and 75 at each of the CoP meetings during this reporting cycle, indicating a 50% increase in attendance from last year. In addition to the meetings, there is a Microsoft TEAMS site for on-going communication & sharing of internal documents to support LEAs in improving transition planning practices. The TEAMS site has 152 users (an increase of 25 new users) and includes secured folders for sharing information/data between the LEA and SEA teams.

Because WVDE/OSE did not meet the target for Indicator 13 in the last reporting cycle, stakeholders decided the SY2023-2024 CoPs needed to expand to include an overview of EBPs, embedded within a focus on developing high-quality Secondary Transition Plans. More information on this can be found in the above section for Indicator 13. When there is alignment between the SSIP and other professional development needs, WVDE/OSE offers opportunities for combining the professional development events for efficiency and impactful outcomes.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Research shows that systemic improvements require consistent implementation over time to see improved and sustained outcomes. Thus, the next steps for each infrastructure activity outlined in this reporting cycle will be continued or expanded unless data or stakeholder input indicates the need for mid-course corrections. Financial support is expected to be maintained by providing similar funding opportunities in the past two reporting cycles. Continued targeted TA and support will be provided regarding transition planning and service delivery. The SSIP Coordinator will continue making connections with stakeholders to develop resources aligned with state priorities and will continue to represent the WVDE and SSIP work on interagency councils as appropriate.

Future data analysis may include evaluating progress toward the SiMR between subgroups (e.g. LEAs receiving funding and those who did not; LEAs with improved indicator 2 and 13 data) and potentially assessing linkages between all secondary school indicators and postschool outcomes. Should any data analysis include subgroups, the evaluation plan would also be appropriately revised. Additional data analysis was considered this year, but it was determined that with the revisions made to the SSIP in FFY 2020, there was not yet enough trend data to examine.

In addition, WVDE/OSE will expand upon the following to support data literacy training and differentiated support for LEAs which was a need that surfaced from the WVGtG CoP Community.

\* WVGtG Data Dive Meetings (optional) - virtual 60 minutes/month of targeted TA focused on data collection and analysis for IDEA indicators.

\* WVGtG Open Doors Meetings (optional) - virtual 60 minutes/month of targeted TA based upon needs of attendees for each meeting where participants will present their questions or problems of practice and WVDE/OSE Coordinators will provide necessary guidance.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

West Virginia LEAs have control over which specific strategies and interventions to use and are allowed to choose evidence-based practices (EBPs) specific to their individual local needs. This flexibility has continued in response to stakeholder feedback and survey data obtained on the successes/challenges of current and previous SSIP work.

LEAs participating in the SSIP must use one of the four EBPs listed below, and those who applied for funding were asked to include in their grant applications a summary of each EBP they intended to implement during the school year. As one of the required progress reports for grantees LEAs were asked, in the Spring of 2023 to describe which practices they were implementing and to share successes/challenges related to those EBPs. The data was analyzed, and four broad categories of EBPs were identified:

\* Educational Supports
\* Student and Family Engagement
\* Systemic Improvements
\* Transition Services

These categories are considered to be the EBPs implemented in West Virginia schools participating in the SSIP.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

The summaries below describe reported activities with include weblinks that provide additional information to the help readers understand the implementation of the broad EBP category.

\* Educational Supports includes activities related to credit recovery; tutoring; dropout prevention, graduation coaches (academic-/tutor specific role); Option Pathway - WV's multiple pathways to graduation found in WVBE Policy 2444.4 [https://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/] WV GEAR UP [https://www.wvgearup.org/] - a federally funded program that helps prepare students for post-secondary training and employment; and problem-solving/goal setting strategies initiated by students with adult support.

\* Student and Family Engagement - includes activities that specifically target at-risk students. Examples include Check and Connect; mentoring; graduation coaches (family support role); social workers; and student assistance teams (SAT) consisting of school staff and parents using data to identify individual student needs and develop plans of support for a wide range of problems, including academics, behavior, social-emotional concerns, and attendance issues. Many of the SSIP/WVGtG participants also have a Communities in Schools site-based coordinator who leverages partnerships to connect students and families with community resources, tailoring them to their specific needs [https://wvde.us/cis/].

\* Systemic Improvements - includes activities that mention programmatic or building-level improvements; implementation of changes to programs/practices based on root cause analysis and data-based decision making; improved IEP compliance; collaboration; and expanded professional development opportunities intended to support and improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

\* Transition Services - include activities related to transition specialist/coach/coordinator; work-based learning, job exploration, and work readiness training; self-advocacy training; transition/job fair events, and simulated workplace opportunities [https://wvde.us/simulated-workplace/]. Also includes pre-ETS services provided by WV Division of Rehabilitation (DRS).

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

\* Educational Supports - 30.39% of LEAs participating in the SSIP focused on this EBP. When students are more successful in school, they are more likely to be engaged in their education. This will impact the SiMR through changes in teacher/provider practices.

\* Student/Family Engagement - 16.67% of LEAs participating in the SSIP focused on this EBP. When students and families are engaged with the school community, attendance increases and they begin to see the benefits of receiving a regular high school diploma. This will impact the SiMR through changes in teacher/provider practices, parent/student outcomes, and district practices.

\* Systemic Improvements - 19.61% of LEAs participating in the SSIP focused on this EBP. When programs, policies, and procedures/practices change to meet the needs of every student, then the culture and climate change over time to become more inclusive. When schools support inclusive practices, then they can begin improving academic performance for all students. This will impact the SiMR through changes in district policies, procedures, and practices.

\* Transition Services - 33.34% of LEAs participating in the SSIP focused on this EBP. When high quality transition plans are written and implemented, students are better prepared to achieve their post-secondary goals related to education/training, employment, and independent living. When students and families see potential for the future, graduation outcomes also improve. This will impact the SiMR through changes in teacher/provider practices, parent/student outcomes, and district practices.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Beginning with SY 2022-23, data collection surveys were revised to include both quantitative and qualitative response options for a mixed method analysis. Data was collected after each targeted TA session and after each stakeholder meeting. The format and content of each survey is similar so that data may be analyzed and compared for continuous improvement activities and to assess practice change.

Data is analyzed and provided to stakeholders throughout the year for monitoring progress toward the SiMR and to determine the impact on systems change practices. Data will be posted annually on the WVGtG webpage [https://wvde.us/special-education/wv-guideposts-to-graduation/] prior to the beginning of the school year.

As indicated, the state-level implementation team regularly reviews data for alignment of practices and communication about statewide initiatives.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Research shows that systemic improvements require consistent implementation over time to see improved outcomes. Thus, the next steps for each evidence-based practice outlined in this reporting cycle will be continued or expanded unless data or stakeholder input indicate the need for mid-course corrections.

Comments from LEA survey responses regarding the Community of Practice format for differentiating TA included: “I enjoyed the collaboration with other county leaders. We share the same issues, and it was nice to hear how they are addressing them.” “I love the online resources and course offerings.” “Love the variety of Transition Inventories. There appears to be something for everyone!!” and “The support throughout the year from WVDE was phenomenal, and the collaborative virtual monthly sessions provided so many resources and such valuable guidance.”

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

\* Educational Supports – WVDE/OSE will continue to provide resources and support to LEAs that will build capacity for them to implement EBPs with consistency and fidelity.

\* Student/Family Engagement - WVDE/OSE will be co-sponsoring a transition event that will provide simultaneous support and professional development to both education staff and families. This event is expected to be held at the end of the SY 2023-24 with the aim of enabling parents and education staff to better engage in transition planning to improve post-school outcomes for students with disabilities.

\* Systemic Improvements – WVDE/OSE will continue to participate in statewide training and supports that are aligned with improving graduation outcomes for all students in West Virginia.

\* Transition Services – WVDE//OSE will continue to offer in-person and virtual support to LEAs, parents, and outside agencies to improve transition planning and services for students with disabilities.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The SSIP data obtained through the evaluation plan supports continued implementation without modifications to ensure a reliable and valid analysis of trend data. Stakeholders have indicated they would like to see a minimum of 3 years of evaluation data without modifications since WV’s SSIP relies on lag data to measure progress toward the SiMR. With this approach, future evaluation data will be able to include comparisons between EBPs, grantees, and improved graduation outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the general stakeholder input and feedback for the SPP/APR reporting period (FFY 2020 - 2026) described below, SSIP stakeholder input has been actively sought and feedback responded to on a regular basis through WV Guideposts to Graduation (WVGtG) website and technical assistance activities. See description and engagement strategies for each stakeholder groups in the next section.

INITIAL TARGET SETTING:

The WVDE/OSE conducted a series of four stakeholder meetings to solicit feedback on the proposed targets for the new SPP/APR package starting in July 2021. An initial series of stakeholder sessions were designed to review current progress and proposed targets as well as the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) with stakeholder groups. Sessions were held for special education directors and practitioners, and for parents, students, and the public. All meetings were held remotely on Teams, announced through existing listservs, and posted on the state webpage. Attendance was collected using a Forms link and participants were invited to provide input in the form of a survey following each session. Recordings of the sessions and links to the survey were posted on the department webpage.

Special Education directors from geographic areas needing additional representation based on the demographic data from the collected survey responses and those from districts with more racial/ethnic diversity were contacted to make arrangements for additional in-person meetings with parent focus groups. This strategy resulted in additional parent feedback from in-person presentations of the current state performance and proposed targets.

Internal input was also solicited to ensure feedback was gathered from interested groups outside of special education. The recordings and surveys were shared with WVDE staff in targeted offices, such as Assessment, School Improvement, and Elementary and Secondary Education.

The baseline for this indicator was presented to stakeholders and updated based on the most current year of data that was not impacted by COVID-19 in order to get the most accurate picture of the number of resolution sessions and their efforts to resolve disputes fairly. The targets were set to maintain a slight increase from 75% each year from FFY 2020 through 2025. This target takes into consideration the low number of resolution sessions handled by the state most years. The stakeholders indicated acceptance of this baseline and targets were set to 75%, but the targets were revised based on feedback from OSEP.

FFY 2022

Stakeholders did not express interest in modifying or revising the Mediation targets during any meetings throughout the reporting period; however, WVDE/OSE is receptive to any potential concerns or recommendations that stakeholders may have regarding these targets.

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

WVGtG stakeholders include an internal team representing state-level offices and programs that provide support for LEAs regarding graduation outcomes. These team members meet periodically in person, but also collaborate extensively through Teams regarding resource development and joint technical assistance to the field. This internal stakeholder team ensures that there is a consistent message regarding graduation expectations for all students in West Virginia. In addition, WVGtG reaches out to external stakeholders through virtual meetings, in-person discussions, and through a survey link on the WVGtG webpage. External stakeholders were engaged through various meetings including a dedicated virtual presentation on 8/4/23 to provide a summary of the work during SY 2022-23 and to solicit suggestions for SY 2023-24. External stakeholders include LEAs, parents and the general public. Typically, parents are represented through WVACEEC, the state advisory panel, (described in the introduction section of this report). The SSIP/WVGtG work was presented in-person on 11/9/2023 with a discussion about how WVDE/OSE can partner with WVACEEC for implementation of appropriate EBPs in local schools. In addition to these meetings, the SSIP coordinator represents WVDE/OSE at quarterly meetings for multiple advocacy groups to support interagency alignment as students prepare for improved post-school outcomes. These groups include the WV Parent Training and Information Center (WVPTI), WV DD Council, Employment First Initiative, and State Rehab Council.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

During the summer of 2023, external stakeholders were presented with data on the evidence-based practices utilized by LEAs that included secondary transition planning. It was suggested by stakeholders that LEAs may have inexperienced staff who do not know how to write appropriate transition goals, and that the SY 2023-24 monthly CoP meetings should focus more heavily on providing technical assistance/professional development for secondary transition planning and delivery of transition services. Thus, the focus of the monthly CoPs started in September 2023 included each of the required components of transition planning and resources that were developed for posting on the WVGtG webpage.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

1) To better reach and train parents in secondary transition planning, WVDE/OSE provided a grant to WV Parent Training and Information, Inc. (WV PTI) for the purchase and implementation of a program titled GUIDING THE JOURNEY: Transition Training Program for Parents. Staff provide monthly training in the evening for approximately 30 families from 18 LEAs. The group is divided equally into age groups 14-16 and 16+ years of age. These parents and caregivers vary significantly with respect to socioeconomic status and level of education.

2) WVDE/OSE is exploring connections for increased interagency work and connections to improved post-school outcomes for students with disabilities. This will include a collaborative Transition Event co-sponsored by the WVDE/OSE and the state’s DD Council; it is currently planned for the end of SY2023-24.

3) WVDE/OSE will have multiple years of data to begin analyzing trends and determining future plans regarding the SSIP.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

1) The WVPTI program is a pilot project currently funded by WVDE/OSE for July 1, 2023 – June 30, 2024. Data collected will include analysis of improved student graduation outcomes from LEAs where parent engagement has improved as a result of this training. Continued funding is expected to be available based upon data obtained during the summer of 2024.

2) Interagency connections will continue to evolve as WVDE/OSE seeks additional opportunities to provide greater support to teachers, staff, and families which will improve both graduation and post school outcomes for students with disabilities.

3) WVDE/OSE plans to review data and analyze trends related to grant funding, graduation/exit from special education, and post-school outcomes. This will inform the continuation of or modifications to the current implementation of the SSIP.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

Barriers identified by stakeholders during this reporting cycle include difficulty finding and accessing special education data, and perceived lack of public transparency. This was addressed through changes to the interactive data dashboard described above, which included the addition of data for public charter schools and the ability to see connections between graduation/drop-out/secondary transition, and whether LEAs were meeting state targets in those areas. In addition, the WVGtG webpage now includes information on secondary transition planning that mirrors the internal training provided through the WVDE Canvas platform.

Stakeholders also identified concerns related to parents being aware of updated resources available on the WVGtG webpage, as well as messaging regarding transition planning expectations for LEAs. While this may be a legitimate concern, WVDE does not have the capacity at this time to reach out to all parents in the state individually; rather WVDE/OSE relies on LEAs to communicate with parents within their geographic boundaries. WVDE will explore more efficient ways to address this concern through a statewide transition event for parents and school staff currently being planned for Spring/Summer 2024, continued collaboration and grant funding for WVPTI, as well as providing consistent messaging at advocate/interagency meetings and collaborative events.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

## 17 - Required Actions

# 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:**

Jonathan Shank

**Title:**

IDEA Part B Data Manager

**Email:**

jonathan.shank@k12.wv.us

**Phone:**

304.558.2696

**Submitted on:**

04/23/24 11:20:51 PM