

**STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART B**

**FOR
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
UNDER THE
*INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT***

**For reporting on
FFY2022**

VIRGINIA



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Not applicable

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Not applicable

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

131

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).

The Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE's) general supervision system to identify noncompliance in special education programs consists of multi-faceted monitoring processes based on a model released by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The State's system includes stakeholder involvement; applications for funding; review of policies and procedures; data collection, reporting, and verification; self-assessments and on-site monitoring with parent involvement; and dispute resolution. On-site monitoring includes visits to school districts; regional special education programs, local and regional jails, and nursing homes; state-operated programs including hospital programs, schools for the deaf and blind, rehabilitation centers, state training schools, state mental health centers, and juvenile detention and adult correctional facilities; and VDOE-licensed private day and residential schools. Visits of local educational agencies (LEAs) and other facilities are conducted on-site or using various virtual platforms such as Zoom, telephone conference calls, virtual use of the LEAs' student record computer system or the Virginia Individualized Education Program (IEP) system, and record scanning.

Virginia's comprehensive monitoring system for continuous improvement is designed to ensure continuous examination of performance for compliance and results. All districts participate annually in some level of Virginia's comprehensive monitoring system. The components of Virginia's comprehensive monitoring system include compliance indicator reviews; on-site focused reviews; and targeted reviews (i.e., self-assessments, audit findings, complaints, investigations).

The VDOE analyzes year-end data for all compliance indicators to identify school districts with performance rates indicating noncompliance. Whenever a finding of noncompliance is identified, the district is required to develop corrective action that addresses all identified areas of noncompliance to include improvement strategies and timelines to ensure correction. Timelines for correction are set, ranging from immediately to one year. The VDOE may require periodic progress reports as necessary and also follow up through frequent visits and/or telephone contacts. For final closure, the district must demonstrate correction according to OSEP's "two-pronged test" for correction. Districts must demonstrate individual and systemic correction as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the notification of noncompliance.

The VDOE's approach to monitoring adherence by all school districts in the State to the Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia includes a five-year cyclical approach. This process allows a rotation of the 131 school districts to be monitored no less than every five years. Each year, between the months of September and December, school districts within that current year's cohort utilize the Core Special Education Assessment (CSEA) to assess its special education programs and services. The assessment process requires the LEA to use the district's special education documents and special education student records, and involves multiple staff to answer the regulatory questions. Following a cohort district's completion and submission to the VDOE of this assessment, assigned monitors conduct a desk audit of the documentation. Subsequently, the monitor conducts a review and validation process with the district by probing/discussing reported noncompliance as well as compliance. This review and validation process also consists of a reassessment by the monitor of randomly selected items in the CSEA and associated district policies, procedures, practices, and student records. A final report is developed to summarize the findings from each area of the review and sent to the district leadership. The summary report identifies strengths and weaknesses of the Special Education Programs, emerging improvements, areas for program improvements, and areas of individual and general supervision noncompliance with Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) regulations.

The VDOE monitors districts' compliance for children with disabilities who have been publicly placed in regional special education programs; local and regional jails; nursing homes; state-operated programs including hospital programs, the school for the deaf and blind, rehabilitation centers, state training schools, state mental health centers, and juvenile detention and adult correctional facilities; and private day and residential schools. Services provided to children with disabilities in these school districts and facilities are monitored in three ways: 1) each must review compliance for children and youth as part of its self-assessment, 2) VDOE reviews the files for children and youth when it conducts its on-site visit to the school district or facility, and 3) VDOE monitors to ensure the provision of free appropriate public education (FAPE) to these students by making on-site visits to the school districts and facilities to ensure compliance and to make recommendations for program improvement.

To ensure that all school districts correct any identified compliance deficiencies within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed one year from identification, VDOE has implemented a tracking system to monitor the correction of the noncompliance findings that were identified through local district self-assessments and the State's on-site reviews. Tracking of noncompliance findings in the self-assessment begins following receipt of the self-assessment reports and program improvement plans. Tracking of noncompliance findings resulting from VDOE's reviews begins from the issue date of the report.

The VDOE continually enhances its IDEA fiscal supervision and monitoring procedures to comply with related distribution and use of IDEA Part B funds and to ensure school districts are being fiscally prudent and compliant with Federal regulations. The supervision of school districts is structured according to tiered levels of risk and need. Virginia's system of general supervision includes several mechanisms to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA funds at the state level. Some of these mechanisms are reached through the VDOE Single Sign-On Web Systems (SSWS) secure internet portal. The applications are designed and embedded with information and instruction on fiscal regulations to assist school districts in maintaining compliance.

Virginia's Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities set forth three special education dispute resolution options to address disagreements regarding the identification, evaluation, educational placement, and services of their child, or the provision of a FAPE. These options include: 1) parents and the local school district entering into mediation to resolve the dispute, 2) the filing of a complaint that the school district has erred in meeting its special education obligations, and 3) the parent or local school district filing a request for a due process hearing to have a hearing officer determine the appropriate outcome for the child.

The Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services (ODRAS) within the VDOE Department of Special Populations: 1) administers the three Federally-mandated special education dispute resolution options; 2) manages facilitated IEPs; 3) provides technical assistance to parents and school districts regarding special education laws and regulations; 4) develops and updates various special education resource materials; 5) provides training to school districts regarding regulatory compliance; and 6) works collaboratively with other offices within the Department of Special Populations, as appropriate. In addition, the Parent Ombudsman serves as a resource to parents in non-legal special education matters.

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.

The purpose of the VDOE's special education technical assistance is to provide evidence-based professional development for quality educational opportunities for children and youth with disabilities. The focus of the activities is access to the general education curriculum and effective practices that lead to successful school achievement and postschool outcomes for students with disabilities from ages 2–21, inclusive. There are ongoing, regularly scheduled activities as well as new initiatives that are field-tested to determine their effectiveness. Staff members provide leadership for activities and initiatives addressing the educational needs of students identified with specific disabilities in all disability categories and specialized processes or procedures including: accessible instructional materials, assistive technology, behavior management, special education eligibility and individualized education program development, special education administration, and related services.

Activities are driven by demographic and achievement-related data analyses. Initiatives are derived from research findings or from systems that have been proven to be effective for students with disabilities through evidence-based practices.

The VDOE also funds regional centers supported by the VDOE Department of Special Populations, known as Training and Technical Assistance Centers (TTACs). The TTACs deliver direct technical assistance and support to LEAs. Their mission is to improve educational opportunities and contribute to the success of children and youth with disabilities. The services are designed to increase the capacity of school personnel, service providers, and families to meet the needs of children and youth with disabilities. The Centers' focus is on educators in schools designated by the VDOE as needing improvement on behalf of students with disabilities. Their offices and libraries are located in universities based in the eight Superintendent of Public Instruction's regions in Virginia.

Additional centers and networks include:

- Accessible Instructional Materials Center of Virginia (AIM-VA): The AIM-VA produces and delivers accessible instructional materials for LEAs in Virginia who have students with an IEP indicating a need for alternate formats of printed materials. The Center also provides training and technical assistance on the use of these accessible instructional materials.
- Assistive Technology (AT) Network: The AT Network is a group of assistive technology specialists from regional TTACs. This group plans and provides statewide technical assistance and professional development regarding AT consideration, evaluation, and implementation. Additionally, members of the AT Network build capacity within districts by assisting with the creation of AT Teams within individual school districts.
- Virginia Commonwealth University's Autism Center for Education (VCU-ACE): The VCU-ACE offers a variety of training opportunities through online and face-to-face training as well as embedded technical assistance in school districts. The VCU-ACE strives to meet the needs of all learners across the state of Virginia by providing training activities and resources for the emergent learner, developing learner, as well as district leaders who provide professional development activities and resources that will assist with systematic change and fidelity of evidence-based practices in autism spectrum disorder (ASD). The VCU-ACE offers a variety of training opportunities through online coursework and many on-demand options such as videos and presentations.
- Community of Leaders in Autism (CoLA): The CoLA is a responsive network of autism leaders from participating districts. The CoLA Teams participate in two regional meetings per year and one statewide summer institute. The CoLA represents a partnership between school districts, VCU-ACE, regional TTACs, and the VDOE. The CoLA members share a common interest in the improvement of service delivery and use of evidence-based practice for students with ASD and create a strong community that fosters trust and encourages collaboration and sharing.
- Technical Assistance Center for Children Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing: The Technical Assistance Center for Children Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing is funded by the VDOE to provide training and technical assistance in the areas of deafness and hearing impairment. Assistance is available to local public school systems as well as state-operated programs, including early intervention through the Virginia Network of Consultants for Professionals Working with Children Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing (VNOG).

- Virginia Project for Children and Young Adults with Deaf-Blindness / Virginia Deaf-Bind Project (VDBP): The VDBP is a statewide program designed to provide technical assistance, training, distance education, and networking information to families, teachers, and service providers of individuals, birth through age 21, who have both a hearing loss and a vision loss. The VDBP is committed to supporting families, teachers, and service providers in their endeavors to improve outcomes for children and youth who experience both vision and hearing loss.
- Center on Transition Innovations (CTI): The Center on Transition Innovations provides resources for professionals, individuals with disabilities, and their representatives and is committed to developing and advancing evidence-based practices to increase the hiring and retention of individuals with disabilities. The Center is designed to research and spotlight the strategies and circumstances that produce optimal employment and career achievement for youth with disabilities and provide knowledge transfer with a variety of information (via webinars, white papers, fact sheets, and online classes). Staff assist school districts with implementation of a variety of programs such as Project Search, Start on Success, Customized Employment, and Supported Employment.
- Center for Family Involvement (CFI): The Center for Family Involvement works with families to increase their skills as decision-makers, mentors, and leaders so that their family members with disabilities can lead the lives they want. Through self-advocacy activities, youth and adults with disabilities have information and support to speak for themselves and be leaders in their home communities and in state-level activities. The Center is committed to helping agencies and organizations deliver person-centered and user-friendly services and supports in neighborhoods and communities.
- Parent Education Advocacy Training Center (PEATC): The PEATC is an independent Center funded by the U.S. Department of Education and serves at Virginia's Federally Funded Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center. The PEATC's information, resources, and training promote respectful, collaborative partnerships between parents, schools, professionals, and the community that increase the possibilities of success for children with disabilities.
- Virginia's Parent Resource Centers (PRCs): The PRCs are committed to a positive relationship between parents and schools. The PRCs assist parents with questions and planning as well as provide resources and training sessions.
- Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports Research and Implementation Center (VTSS-RIC): The VTSS-RIC's mission is to build state and local capacity for a sustained tiered system of academic, behavioral, and social-emotional supports that are responsive to the needs of all students. The VTSS-RIC assists VDOE with the evaluation of participating LEAs through their participation in both the Response to Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) components of VTSS.

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.

Professional development and related resources are developed to provide support and professional development to parents, school personnel, and other consumers. All resources are intended to provide guidance for addressing the regulatory requirements and instructional elements needed for a student's FAPE that is linked directly to the indicators and improvement activities established in the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). Through this model, the VDOE uses a variety of means, at varying levels of intensity, to build capacity throughout the State. The State's Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia provide state-operating standards for districts along with the following accompanying guidance documents: 1) Implementation of the Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia, 2009; 2) Developing Local Policies and Procedures Required for Implementation of Special Education Regulations in Virginia's Public Schools; and 3) the Virginia Family's Guide to Special Education

The VDOE Department of Special Populations staff members are assigned to regional teams to provide technical assistance and professional development, including one representative from each of the following offices on each team: Special Education Instructional Services (SEIS); Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services (ODRAS); Special Education Program Improvement (SEPI); and Special Education Family Support and Special Facilities (SEFSSF). The regional teams provide guidance for addressing the regulatory requirements and instructional elements needed for a student's FAPE.

In addition, the VDOE Department of Special Populations e-learning modules provide an opportunity for individuals to increase knowledge and skills in a variety of areas such as: Special Education Evaluation and Services, Prior Written Notice, Calculating and Reporting Placement and Services, and Back to Basics modules focused on compliance with Federal law and state regulations.

The Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports (VTSS) is a data-informed, decision-making framework for establishing the academic, behavioral, social, and emotional supports needed for a school to be an effective learning environment for all students. The VTSS systemic approach allows districts, schools, and communities to provide multiple levels of supports to students in a more effective, efficient, and clearly defined process. Implementing the VTSS requires the use of evidence-based, system-wide practices with fidelity to provide a quick response to academic, behavioral, social, and emotional needs. The practices are progress-monitored frequently to enable educators to make sound, data-based instructional decisions for students.

Two leadership academies provide professional development for administrators. The Aspiring Special Education Leaders Academy is a program established to assist school districts and state-operated programs with succession planning and is designed to help prepare potential leaders for future administrative positions in special education. This yearlong program includes workshops, seminars, observations, assignments, and field experiences. Participants have opportunities to gain knowledge, skills, and experiences that will help them excel in positions of special educational leadership. The New Special Education Directors Academy provides orientation of the various VDOE offices, critical technical assistance resources, regulatory information, dispute resolution, and a mentor for newly appointed administrators.

The VDOE supports seven TTACs, located at universities across the Commonwealth, to improve educational opportunities and contribute to the success of children and youth with disabilities (birth through age 22). The VDOE determines the scope of work for the TTACs, which is outlined in an annual cooperative agreement holding TTACs responsible for the regional delivery of school improvement, special education, early learning, and school readiness services. The cooperative agreement details specific responsibilities in the work of TTACs with local districts and community schools, organized by priority areas. The TTACs provide varying levels of technical assistance and professional development in these areas, based on LEAs' SPP/APR performance and compliance indicator data. The TTACs use multiple years of SPP/APR data to identify patterns of strengths and weaknesses within each LEA and across LEAs located in their regions. The TTACs also provide information and services regarding IDEA to parents and families of children with disabilities and those at risk of being identified as disabled.

The VDOE's TTAC Online is a resource for professionals and family members of children and youth with disabilities (birth through age 22). The website offers a wide range of resources, events (trainings, conferences, and webinars/webcasts), and free online training opportunities. Online trainings cover a wide range of topics such as assistive technology, behavior, curriculum and instruction, and transition.

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.

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

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

Yes

Number of Parent Members:

161

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.

Parent members of the Virginia SSEAC, PEATC staff, parents from local and statewide advisory committees, focus groups comprised of parents and youth with disabilities, and individual parents were engaged in reviewing the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing historical and current data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. As explained above, VDOE staff members held numerous opportunities to gather stakeholder input that spanned from February 2023 through January 2024. Following each event, the indicator chairs summarized the discussion and documented stakeholder input. VDOE staff members engaged with a myriad of stakeholders including parents, youth with disabilities, and countless persons with disabilities. These highly valued partnerships provided framework and connection to Virginia's FFY 2022 Part B SPP/APR.

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.

The VDOE staff once again made a deliberate attempt to be more inclusive across Virginia's vast geographic regions to capture a more representative population of the State's diverse group of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. Specifically, staff from the VDOE Department Special Populations Office of Special Education Family Support and Special Facilities (SEFSSF) provided services in all eight Superintendent's Regions within the Commonwealth during this period by providing more than three dozen presentations/trainings on the following topics:

- Critical Decision Points for Families of Children with Disabilities
- Communicating and Collaborating with Your School Division
- Family Engagement and Secondary Transition
- Legal Requirements and Effectiveness Training for Local Special Education Advisory Committees (SEACs)
- Helping Your Child Develop Autonomy
- The Role of the Special Education Parent Ombudsman

These activities were conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In addition, SEFSSF staff provided information directly to over 25,000 family members through the "Engage Your Family" newsletter via GovDelivery and countless points of contact through X (formerly known as Twitter) (@VDOE_SESS, #FamilyEngagementFriday); the Information for Families webpage on the VDOE website; and numerous one-pager resources for families on various topics.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

From February 2023 through January 2024, staff members from the VDOE organized and engaged with numerous stakeholder groups, including parents, youth with disabilities, state and local advisory panels, advocacy groups, local district staff, communities of practice, university faculty, and other state agency staff members. Specifically, VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on analyzing the data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress across numerous settings throughout the year since the last submission of the Part B APR.

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.

In addition to the mechanism described above, a culminating stakeholder meeting was held in late January 2024 with a diverse group of stakeholders including State Advisory Panel members, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, staff from advocacy organizations and individual parents to review the results of the progress on achieving targets, analyzing current and past data, and review improvement strategies across all IDEA Part B indicators. The Special Education Performance Report to the Public will be disseminated to all school districts in the State, to members of the SSEAC, and will be available on the VDOE website at the link listed below.

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.

The VDOE has developed its SPP with input from stakeholders and with the expectation that the SPP would be disseminated to the public following the submission of the APR each February. The VDOE reports to the public on the progress or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP each June of the same year and refers to this as the Special Education Performance Report to the Public. Additionally, the VDOE reports to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP.

The Special Education Performance Report to the Public is disseminated to all school districts in the State, to members of the SSEAC, and is available online at <https://vdoe.prod.govaccess.org/programs-services/special-education/reports-plans-statistics/special-education-performance-report-2021-2022>. The SPP is also available here at <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/spp-apr-letters?selected-category=&selected-year=&state=Virginia>.

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

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
2020	70.74%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	56.00%	56.00%	61.00%	70.74%	71.24%
Data	59.80%	61.24%	62.88%	70.74%	71.20%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	71.74%	72.24%	72.74%	73.24%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022-2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other

state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

Prepopulated Data (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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)	8,962
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)	
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)	2,513
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)	14
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)	1,239

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
8,962	12,728	71.20%	71.74%	70.41%	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.

To have graduated in 2021-2022 with a regular diploma (Standard Diploma) in Virginia, a student earned at least 22 standard units of credit by passing required courses and electives. The minimum course requirements included: English (4); Math (3); Laboratory Science (3); History and Social Sciences (3); Health and Physical Education (2); World Language, Fine Arts, or Career and Technical Education (2); Economics and Personal Finance (1); and electives (4). The student must also have earned a board-approved career and technical education credential and successfully completed one virtual course, which may have been noncredit bearings.

All recipients of the Standard Diploma earned at least five verified credits by passing end-of-course Standards of Learning (SOL) tests (i.e., statewide assessments) or other assessments approved by the State Board of Education. The minimum verified units of credit include: English (2), Math (1), Laboratory Science (1), and History and Social Sciences (1). Additional information pertaining to the minimum course and credit requirements for the Standard Diploma can be found at <https://www.doe.virginia.gov/parents-students/for-students/graduation/diploma-options/standard-diploma-graduation-requirements>.

In addition, students shall be trained in emergency first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), and the use of automated external defibrillators (AED), including hands-on practice of the skills necessary to perform cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Students with an IEP or 504 Plan that documents that they cannot successfully complete this training shall be granted a waiver from this graduation requirement, as provided in 8VAC20-131-420(B).

Demonstration of the 5 C's - In accordance with the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, students shall acquire and demonstrate foundational skills in Virginia's 5 C's: critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and citizenship.

The conditions to graduate with a regular high school diploma in Virginia are the same for all students, including students with IEPs.

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
2020	6.66%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	1.50%	1.40%	1.40%	6.66%	6.41%
Data	1.70%	1.51%	1.42%	6.66%	8.30%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	6.16%	5.91%	5.66%	5.41%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other

state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

Prepopulated Data (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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)	8,962
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)	
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)	2,513
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)	14
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)	1,239

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
1,239	12,728	8.30%	6.16%	9.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Stakeholders believe the reason for slippage is twofold: 1) ongoing challenges with recruitment and retention of staff that serve as points and links of contact for students and families; and 2) many families left the area due to the impact of the pandemic and students did not re-enroll, often entering the workforce.

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

The VDOE defines a dropout as a student who ends their high school education before earning a diploma, high school equivalency, or certificate of completion.

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)

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	81.66%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	67.48%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	82.75%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	81.05%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	68.48%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	80.26%

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

During the development of Virginia’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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)	13,753	13,161	11,299
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	12,618	11,832	9,272
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	8	7	8
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,085	1,102	1,110

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)	13,749	13,177	5,028
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	12,611	11,809	3,190
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	0	0	3
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,084	1,103	1,051

- (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	13,711	13,753	99.60%	95.00%	99.69%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	12,941	13,161	97.63%	95.00%	98.33%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	10,390	11,299	83.65%	95.00%	91.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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	13,695	13,749	99.46%	95.00%	99.61%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	12,912	13,177	97.15%	95.00%	97.99%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4,244	5,028	92.45%	95.00%	84.41%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Virginia's approved participation and pass rates for HS are cohort-based rates using the same cohort of students used for on-time graduation rates. The students in the 2023 cohort, which is measured here, were 9th graders during the COVID-19 school closures. Therefore, this group of students saw the highest number of tests waivers and locally awarded verified credits (LAVC) for high school math assessments out of all other affected cohorts. Virginia's accountability calculations require that students whose tests were waived or whose credit was awarded using an locally awarded verified credit (LAVC) be removed from the cohort participation rate and pass rate to insure these waivers do not overly inflate or negatively affect the participation and performance of those students whose tests were not waived. Additionally, the following school year, many were still attending virtual school and were not in Virginia public schools for testing. Virginia acknowledges that the number of HS students taking math assessments in this cohort is significantly lower than typical years for both all students as well as students with disabilities due to the number of students affected by the 2019-2020 school year and the 2020-2021 school 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.

1. Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at: <https://www.doe.virginia.gov/programs-services/special-education/reports-plans-statistics> (scroll to 2022-2023 at bottom of the page).

- Part B Assessment - Table 6
- Part B Assessment - State, Division, and School Levels

In addition, Virginia's State Quality Profile provides information about student achievement for all children, including children with disabilities, across all subjects, proficiency levels, and participation rates of student achievement at: <http://schoolquality.virginia.gov/virginia-state-quality-profile#desktopTabs-2> and ESSA – <http://schoolquality.virginia.gov/virginia-state-quality-profile#desktopTabs-8>

2. Further disaggregation of the assessment data can be obtained by using the Build-A-Table to create reports on student performance by student subgroup (including students with disabilities) taking regular assessments, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards at the State, district, and school levels at: <https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/buildatable/testresults>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results.

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	2020	38.05%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	30.68%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	47.95%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	27.95%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	21.75%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	37.60%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	39.05%	39.55%	40.05%	40.55%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	31.68%	32.18%	32.68%	33.18%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	48.95%	49.45%	49.95%	50.45%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	28.95%	29.45%	29.95%	30.45%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	22.75%	23.25%	23.75%	24.25%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	38.60%	39.10%	39.60%	40.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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	12,626	11,839	9,280
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,585	4,086	5,513
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5	3	0

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	12,611	11,809	3,193
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,065	3,919	1,216
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0

(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 (FFY 2021 Data is intentionally left blank by USED)

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	5,590	12,626		39.05%	44.27%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	4,089	11,839		31.68%	34.54%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	5,513	9,280		48.95%	59.41%	Met target	N/A

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment (FFY 2021 Data is intentionally left blank by USED)

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	5,065	12,611		28.95%	40.16%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	3,919	11,809		22.75%	33.19%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,216	3,193		38.60%	38.08%	Did not meet target	N/A

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.

1. Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at: <https://www.doe.virginia.gov/programs-services/special-education/reports-plans-statistics> (scroll to 2022-2023 at bottom of the page).
 - Part B Assessment - Table 6
 - Part B Assessment - State, Division, and School Levels
2. In addition, Virginia's State Quality Profile provides information about student achievement for all children, including children with disabilities, across all subjects, proficiency levels, and participation rates of student achievement at: <http://schoolquality.virginia.gov/virginia-state-quality-profile#desktopTabs-2> and ESSA - <http://schoolquality.virginia.gov/virginia-state-quality-profile#desktopTabs-8>
3. Further disaggregation of the assessment data can be obtained by using the Build-A-Table to create reports on student performance by student subgroup (including students with disabilities) taking regular assessments, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards at the State, district, and school levels at: <https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/buildatable/testresults>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 3B – HS Math Slippage Statement.

Virginia's statewide proficiency data for SY 2021-2022 math (FS175) submitted on 4/20/2023 was not prepopulated into the FFY2022 Part B SPP/APR. This omission prohibits the application from calculating slippage as defined in the Part B SPP/APR. VDOE staff believe several factors contributed to the minimal slippage on this indicator. In stakeholder meetings and feedback sessions, local school division personnel reported that due to continued impact from the pandemic, students with disabilities required more intensive and frequent instructional and social emotional/behavioral services that resulted in more time in settings outside of the general education class, including separate schools/placements, residential facilities, etc. Based on the Part B Tree of Influence, the least restrictive environment (where students receive instruction and from whom - properly endorsed personnel) directly impacts instruction and assessment. These trends have therefore impacted indicator 3 assessment performance in mathematics. Additionally, due to the pandemic, foundational skills that would have been acquired in the previous two grade levels before 2022, resulted in lower performance because of resulting impacts to instructional opportunity that adversely affected student performance in the content area in higher level courses. The Virginia Department of Education has continually provided professional development, training, and resources on evidence-based practices for teaching and learning as well as post-pandemic supports focused on high-intensity instruction.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 3 attachment(s) included in the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results.

OSEP's Required Actions to the State's FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission required the State to make available the attachment not posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter. The State has not publicly posted the attachment.

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 *EDFacts* 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	2021	74.17%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2021	71.95%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2021	79.22%
Math	A	Grade 4	2021	65.53%
Math	B	Grade 8	2021	66.72%
Math	C	Grade HS	2021	72.89%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	74.67%	75.17%	75.67%	76.17%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	72.45%	72.95%	73.45%	73.95%

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	79.72%	80.22%	80.72%	81.22%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	66.03%	66.53%	67.03%	67.53%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	67.22%	67.72%	68.22%	68.72%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	73.39%	73.89%	74.39%	74.89%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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	1,085	1,102	1,110
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	872	806	793

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	1,084	1,103	1,051
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	722	899	705

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment (FFY 2021 Data is intentionally left blank by USED)

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	872	1,085		74.67%	80.37%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	806	1,102		72.45%	73.14%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	793	1,110		79.72%	71.44%	Did not meet target	N/A

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment (FFY 2021 Data is intentionally left blank by USED)

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	722	1,084		66.03%	66.61%	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	899	1,103		67.22%	81.50%	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	705	1,051		73.39%	67.08%	Did not meet target	N/A

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.

1. Measures of Academic Success data in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) can be found at: <https://www.doe.virginia.gov/programs-services/special-education/reports-plans-statistics> (scroll to 2022-2023 at bottom of the page).
 - Part B Assessment - Table 6
 - Part B Assessment - State, Division, and School Levels
2. In addition, Virginia's State Quality Profile provides information about student achievement for all children, including children with disabilities, across all subjects, proficiency levels, and participation rates of student achievement at: <http://schoolquality.virginia.gov/virginia-state-quality-profile#desktopTabs-2> and ESSA - <http://schoolquality.virginia.gov/virginia-state-quality-profile#desktopTabs-8>
3. Further disaggregation of the assessment data can be obtained by using the Build-A-Table to create reports on student performance by student subgroup (including students with disabilities) taking regular assessments, and alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards at the State, district, and school levels at: <https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/buildatable/testresults>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Virginia's statewide proficiency data for SY 2021-2022 math (FS175) and reading (FS178) submitted on 4/20/2023 was not prepopulated into the FFY2022 Part B SPP/APR. This omission prohibits the application from calculating slippage as defined in the Part B SPP/APR.

Indicator 3C – HS Reading and HS Math - Slippage Statements

In the 2021-2022 school year, a new Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAAP) was implemented. This was a shift from a portfolio design where students submitted Collections of Evidence consisting of work samples to an assessment with increased rigor that included a set of test questions with three answer choices delivered in an online or paper format. The implementation of this new type of test may have contributed to the slippage for this indicator in both high school reading and high school math.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link to FFY 2022 publicly-reported assessment results.

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 *EDFacts* 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	2020	29.67
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	38.53
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	33.54
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	27.34
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	34.21
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	22.27

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	28.67	28.17	27.67	27.17

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	37.53	37.03	36.53	36.03
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	32.54	32.04	31.54	31.04
Math	A <=	Grade 4	26.34	25.84	25.34	24.84
Math	B <=	Grade 8	33.21	32.71	32.21	31.71
Math	C <=	Grade HS	21.27	20.77	20.27	19.77

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts 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	89,915	93,291	89,136
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,626	11,839	9,280
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	65,272	65,802	78,547
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5	3	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,585	4,086	5,513
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5	3	0

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	90,614	93,837	19,961
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,611	11,809	3,193
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	63,244	63,876	13,873
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,065	3,919	1,216
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	0	0

(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 (FFY 2021 Data is intentionally left blank by USED)

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	44.27%	72.60%		28.67	28.32	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	34.54%	70.54%		37.53	36.00	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	59.41%	88.12%		32.54	28.71	Met target	N/A

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment (FFY 2021 Data is intentionally left blank by USED)

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	40.16%	69.79%		26.34	29.63	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	33.19%	68.07%		33.21	34.88	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	38.08%	69.50%		21.27	31.42	Did not meet target	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 3D – 4th Grade Math – Missed Target (No Slippage)

- Virginia’s statewide proficiency data for SY 2021-2022 math (FS175) submitted on 4/20/2023 was not prepopulated into the FFY2022 Part B SPP/APR. This omission prohibits the application from calculating slippage as defined in the Part B SPP/APR. It is important to note, Virginia saw slight improvement in the gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards from 29.78% in SY 2021-2022 down to 29.63% in SY 2022-2023.

Indicator 3D – 8th Math – Missed Target (No Slippage)

- Virginia’s statewide proficiency data for SY 2021-2022 math (FS175) submitted on 4/20/2023 was not prepopulated into the FFY2022 Part B SPP/APR. This omission prohibits the application from calculating slippage as defined in the Part B SPP/APR. It is important to note, Virginia saw slight improvement in the gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards from 35.74% in SY 2021-2022 down to 34.88% in SY 2022-2023.

Indicator 3D – HS Math - Slippage Statement

- VDOE staff believe several factors contributed to missing the FFY2022 target on this indicator. In stakeholder meetings and feedback sessions, local school division personnel reported that due to continued impact from the pandemic, students with disabilities required more intensive and frequent instructional and social emotional/behavioral services that resulted in more time in settings outside of the general education class, including separate schools/placements, residential facilities, etc. Based on the Part B Tree of Influence, the least restrictive environment (where students receive instruction and from whom - properly endorsed personnel) directly impacts instruction and assessment. These trends have therefore impacted indicator 3 assessment performance in mathematics. Additionally, due to the pandemic, foundational skills that would have been acquired in the previous two grade levels before 2022, resulted in lower performance because of resulting impacts to instructional opportunity that adversely affected student performance in the content area and variability with access. The Virginia Department of Education has continually provided professional development, training, and resources on evidence-based practices for teaching and learning as well as post-pandemic supports focused on high-intensity instruction.

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable)}} \right] \times 100$.

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
2016	46.34%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	39.13%	49.37%	41.57%	73.68%	50.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

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.

88

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
28	44	50.00%	0.00%	63.64%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage for indicator 4 may be, in part, attributed to the significant social and emotional impact experienced during the pandemic. Positive behavioral interventions and supports, such as trauma-informed care, were made available upon return to in-person learning. VDOE monitoring staff have placed more emphasis on ensuring that the processes related to discipline are strictly enforced to ensure protections for students with disabilities, as is required from the Virginia Regulations. Training and technical assistance staff also continue to focus on ensuring availability of resources to ensure equity and the provision of behavior supports to students with disabilities by local school divisions and staff.

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

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

To determine significant discrepancy, the VDOE evaluated the degree to which students with disabilities may or may not be at higher risk for being suspended or expelled compared to students without disabilities by computing risk ratios depicting the proportion of students with disabilities in the rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than ten cumulative days in a school year compared to their nondisabled peers in the same district. Risk ratios were computed for districts with a minimum cell size (numerator) of greater than ten students with disabilities suspended or expelled more than ten cumulative days in a school year, an n-size (denominator) of at least more than ten students with disabilities, and a minimum cell size of at least more than ten students in the comparison group. Districts that met the minimum cell size/n-size with risk ratios 2.0 or greater were deemed to have a significant discrepancy and required to determine if the significant discrepancy was due to policies, procedures, and/or practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and/or procedural safeguards by completing a self-assessment. (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

Using 2021-2022 data, 28 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with disabilities in FFY 2022. The VDOE directed the 28 districts to create a district-based team and complete a formalized self-assessment. The components of the self-assessment tool required the teams to do the following: 1) examine the reasons for high suspensions by analyzing the root cause of suspensions and expulsions; 2) review the school's use of positive behavior interventions and supports; 3) determine if the school district is developing and implementing appropriate IEPs based on a sampling of IEPs of students who were suspended, or expelled, ten or more days cumulative; 4) assess if policies, procedures, and practices comply with Procedural Safeguards; 5) provide more training for individuals responsible for discipline; and 6) review the disability impact prior to disciplinary action.

The teams also had to determine if specific attention was required to improve the implementation of Functional Behavior Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plans as components of PBIS. Alternatives to suspension, such as restorative justice practices and VTSS, are offered as tools to reduce suspensions and to align with other efforts to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Culturally responsive practices and school climate are emphasized as a focus when reviewing policies, procedures, and practices.

The VDOE reviewed all 28 self-assessments and concluded that one district did have noncompliance with one or more of the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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 VDOE directed the one district to revise its policies, procedures, and practices; the use of PBIS; and/or procedural safeguards as soon as possible, but no later than within one year of the date of original notification. The VDOE directed the LEA to determine if its policies, procedures, and practices contributed to or had an impact on IEP noncompliance. The district submitted an acceptable corrective action plan. Monitoring staff members are following up with the district to ensure that 1) they have corrected any individual case of noncompliance (student specific) and 2) they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements at 100 percent compliance (systemic). The status of compliance will be reported in the next APR report.

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	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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

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

The pandemic greatly impacted the number of school districts included in the annual analysis of rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs due to not meeting Virginia’s minimum cell size/n-size requirements. Statewide, in school year 2020-2021, there were only 86 students with disabilities that accumulated greater than ten days out of school suspensions/expulsions cumulative compared to 2,700 in the final full year prior to the pandemic. Historically, approximately 66 percent of Virginia’s LEAs were included in the annual analysis of rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs in the annual analysis.

In school year 2021-2022, over 2,300 students with disabilities accumulated greater than ten days out of school suspensions/expulsions cumulative compared to only 86 in 2020-2021 during the pandemic. In FFY 2022, the VDOE nearly returned to pre-pandemic levels in its analysis of rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

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
2016	0.76%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.76%	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/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.

98

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
27	1	34	0.00%	0%	2.94%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

Slippage for indicator 4 may be, in part, attributed to the significant social and emotional impact experienced during the pandemic. Positive behavioral interventions and supports, such as trauma-informed care, were made available upon return to in-person learning. VDOE monitoring staff have placed more emphasis on ensuring that the processes related to discipline are strictly enforced to ensure protections for students with disabilities, as is required from the Virginia Regulations. Training and technical assistance staff also continue to focus on ensuring availability of resources to ensure equity and the provision of behavior supports to students with disabilities by local school divisions and staff.

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

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

Yes

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

To determine significant discrepancy, the VDOE evaluated the degree to which students with disabilities in specific racial/ethnic groups may or may not be at higher risk for being suspended or expelled compared to students without disabilities by computing risk ratios depicting the proportion of students with disabilities in specific racial/ethnic groups in the rate of suspensions and expulsions greater than ten cumulative days in a school year compared to their nondisabled peers in the same district. Risk ratios were computed for districts with a minimum cell size (numerator) of more than ten students with disabilities in specific racial/ethnic groups suspended or expelled more than ten cumulative days in a school year, an n-size (denominator) of at least more than ten students with disabilities in specific racial/ethnic groups, and a minimum cell size of at least more than ten students in the comparison group (nondisabled). Districts that met the minimum cell size/n-size with risk ratios greater than 2.0 were deemed to have a significant discrepancy and required to determine if the significant discrepancy was due to policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and/or procedural safeguards by completing a self-assessment. (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Overall, 98 of 132 districts were totally excluded from the significant discrepancy calculation because they did not meet the minimum cell size/n-size for students with disabilities, by race/ethnicity, suspended or expelled greater than ten days in a school year in all racial/ethnic areas.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

Using 2021-2022 data, 27 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for students with disabilities in FFY 2022. The VDOE directed the 27 districts to create a district-based team and complete a formalized self-assessment. The components of the self-assessment tool required the teams to do the following: 1) examine the reasons for high suspensions by analyzing the root cause of suspensions and expulsions; 2) review the school's use of positive behavior interventions and supports; 3) determine if the school district is developing and implementing appropriate IEPs based on a sampling of IEPs of students who were suspended, or expelled, ten or more days cumulative; 4) assess if policies, procedures, and practices comply with Procedural Safeguards; 5) provide more training for individuals responsible for discipline; and 6) review the disability impact prior to disciplinary action.

The teams also had to determine if specific attention was required to improve the implementation of Functional Behavior Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plans as components of PBIS. Alternatives to suspension, such as restorative justice practices and VTSS, are offered as tools to reduce suspensions and to align with other efforts to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Culturally responsive practices and school climate are emphasized as a focus when reviewing policies, procedures, and practices.

The VDOE reviewed all 27 self-assessments and concluded that one district did have noncompliance with one or more of the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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 VDOE directed the one district to revise its policies, procedures, and practices, the use of PBIS, and/or procedural safeguards as soon as possible, but no later than within one year of the date of original notification. The VDOE directed the LEA to determine if its policies, procedures, and practices contributed to or had an impact on IEP noncompliance. The district submitted an acceptable corrective action plan. Monitoring staff members are following up with the district to ensure that 1) they have corrected any individual case of noncompliance (student specific) and 2) they are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements at 100 percent compliance (systemic). The status of compliance will be reported in the next APR report.

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	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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

The pandemic greatly impacted the number of school districts included in the annual analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs due to not meeting Virginia’s minimum cell size/n-size requirements. Statewide, in school year 2020-2021, there were only 86 students with disabilities that accumulated greater than ten days out of school suspensions/expulsions cumulative compared to 2,700 in the final full year prior to the pandemic. Historically, approximately 66 percent of Virginia’s LEAs were included in the annual analysis of rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs in the annual analysis.

In school year 2021-2022, over 2,300 students with disabilities accumulated greater than ten days out of school suspensions/expulsions cumulative compared to only 86 in 2020-2021 during the pandemic. In FFY 2022, the VDOE nearly returned to pre-pandemic levels in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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. 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. 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. 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 >=	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	71.60%	72.10%
A	71.60%	Data	65.07%	67.60%	67.78%	71.60%	69.22%
B	2020	Target <=	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.40%	8.15%
B	8.40%	Data	10.16%	9.30%	9.15%	8.40%	10.87%
C	2020	Target <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	3.91%	3.81%
C	3.91%	Data	4.32%	4.39%	4.51%	3.91%	3.82%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	72.60%	73.10%	73.60%	74.10%
Target B <=	7.90%	7.65%	7.40%	7.15%
Target C <=	3.71%	3.61%	3.51%	3.41%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

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	165,365
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	115,630
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	15,966
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	4,501
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	474
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	1,180

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	115,630	165,365	69.22%	72.60%	69.92%	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	15,966	165,365	10.87%	7.90%	9.66%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	6,155	165,365	3.82%	3.71%	3.72%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	34.00%	35.00%	34.00%	24.65%	24.90%
A	Data	34.48%	31.44%	33.95%	24.65%	25.58%
B	Target <=	19.00%	17.00%	26.00%	38.85%	38.60%

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
B	Data	25.43%	29.34%	28.92%	38.85%	39.08%
C	Target <=				6.27%	6.00%
C	Data				6.27%	4.97%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

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	24.65%
B	2020	38.85%
C	2020	6.27%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	25.15%	25.40%	25.65%	25.90%
Target B <=	38.35%	38.10%	37.85%	37.60%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	5.75%	5.50%	5.25%	5.00%

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	4,600	6,408	1,463	12,471
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	915	2,038	568	3,521
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	2,242	2,453	467	5,162
b2. Number of children attending separate school	8	5	2	15
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	5	1	1	7
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	270	191	36	497

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	3,521	12,471	25.58%	25.15%	28.23%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,184	12,471	39.08%	38.35%	41.57%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	497	12,471	4.97%	5.75%	3.99%	Met target	No Slippage

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

FFY 2022 was post-pandemic. The number of children served in Part B 619 increased significantly from the previous year. Virginia increased our percentage of children attending a regular early childhood program; however, the percentage of children served in separate classrooms increased due to more children having disabilities requiring more support. Fewer children were able to access early intervention during the pandemic or received services remotely, likely resulting in intervention being delayed for many.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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	2008	Target >=	90.00%	90.10%	90.10%	91.25%	91.50%
A1	82.00%	Data	92.59%	93.08%	93.17%	92.56%	89.53%
A2	2008	Target >=	57.80%	57.90%	56.00%	55.00%	55.25%
A2	55.00%	Data	52.88%	51.32%	46.91%	44.64%	41.42%
B1	2008	Target >=	93.90%	94.00%	94.00%	94.25%	94.50%
B1	83.00%	Data	94.74%	94.84%	94.87%	94.29%	91.19%
B2	2008	Target >=	46.90%	47.00%	43.06%	38.00%	38.25%
B2	38.00%	Data	44.36%	43.06%	40.12%	37.22%	34.24%
C1	2008	Target >=	90.90%	91.00%	91.00%	91.25%	91.50%
C1	82.00%	Data	91.71%	92.52%	92.97%	91.33%	88.50%
C2	2008	Target >=	65.20%	65.30%	62.00%	61.00%	61.25%
C2	61.00%	Data	60.04%	58.19%	55.26%	52.43%	48.55%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	91.75%	92.00%	92.25%	92.50%
Target A2 >=	55.50%	55.75%	56.00%	56.25%
Target B1 >=	94.75%	95.00%	95.25%	95.50%
Target B2 >=	38.50%	38.75%	39.00%	39.25%
Target C1 >=	91.75%	92.00%	92.25%	92.50%
Target C2 >=	61.50%	61.75%	62.00%	62.25%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

5,876

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	46	0.78%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	408	6.94%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,113	52.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,827	31.09%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	482	8.20%

Outcome A – FFY Data

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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,940	5,394	89.53%	91.75%	91.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,309	5,876	41.42%	55.50%	39.30%	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	33	0.56%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	351	5.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,445	58.63%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,888	32.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	159	2.71%

Outcome B – FFY Data

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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,333	5,717	91.19%	94.75%	93.28%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,047	5,876	34.24%	38.50%	34.84%	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	59	1.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	465	7.91%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,545	43.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,127	36.20%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	680	11.57%

Outcome C – FFY Data

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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,672	5,196	88.50%	91.75%	89.92%	Did not meet target	No 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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,807	5,876	48.55%	61.50%	47.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Reasons for Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Slippage from FFY 2021 can be associated with a continued intensive and ongoing effort by the VDOE to improve the process used to determine ratings for Indicator 7. Resources have been developed and professional development provided. Specifically, a focus has been placed on using the COS process to determine the child's abilities at program entry and exit, making the process objective and team based. The VDOE anticipated slippage of data given the efforts to improve the process and accuracy of ratings.

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.

All school districts submitted placement upon entry data and placement upon exit data gathered through the COS process through a secure, web-based application developed by VDOE. All components of Indicator 7 are included in the application and data entered reflect children, ages three through five, that received special education and related services for at least six months and exited during the reporting period July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023. The process includes edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy in reporting. Staff members from VDOE provided information related to data required for Indicator 7 and on procedures for submitting data to the VDOE through statewide training sessions. Data submitted by school districts were reviewed for accuracy, and school districts were notified when there appeared to be inaccurate reporting.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

During the development of Virginia’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.30%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%	80.00%	82.00%
Data	85.52%	89.48%	86.68%	85.60%	83.70%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	84.00%	86.00%	88.00%	90.00%

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
8,461	10,865	83.70%	84.00%	77.87%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The VDOE collected stakeholder input regarding the previous dissemination process for the survey and concluded that the feedback from stakeholders supported a revision to the dissemination process. Therefore, this was the first year of the new dissemination process and this slippage reflects the transition to this process.

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.

For the FFY 2022 data collection, the survey was made available to all parents, including parents of preschool-age children, in both an online format and a hard copy format in both English and Spanish versions. Copies of the English and Spanish surveys were printed and mailed to local school divisions by the VDOE. The VDOE also provided school divisions with a one-page document that explained the parent survey and provided parents with the QR Code and direct weblink to the survey. Information announcing the distribution of the survey was sent to local special education administrators, members of the SSEAC, Virginia’s PEATC, Parent Resource Center Coordinators, and other community stakeholder groups/associations in positions to identify and encourage parents of students with disabilities to complete and return the survey. The results of the survey were combined to include preschool, elementary, middle, and high school for one analysis.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

178,892

Percentage of respondent parents

6.07%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	7.91%	6.07%

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

The measure used to determine representativeness was +/- 3 percentage point difference in the proportion of responders as compared to the target population.

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.

The table below shows the counts and percentages for the two demographic categories that VDOE used in analyzing the percentage point differences between the VDOE child count data and the parent survey responses. The VDOE considered parent survey responses to be representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services if the difference between the percentages by each race/ethnicity category and disability category are within plus or minus three percentage points. Three of the seven race/ethnicity categories and 10 of the 13 disability categories were found to be representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Note: The less than symbol in the next two tables indicate data that is 10 or less.

Race/Ethnicity Difference	Child Count Total	Percentage	Survey Responses	Percentage	Percentage Point
American Indian/Alaska Native	495	0.28%	55	0.44%	0.16
Asian	6,996	3.91%	639	5.13%	1.22
Black or African American	44,665	24.98%	2,170	17.42%	-7.56
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	233	0.13%	34	0.27%	0.14
Hispanic/Latino	31,867	17.83%	1,259	10.10%	-7.73
White (not Hispanic)	82,943	46.40%	6,957	55.83%	9.43
Two or more races	11,569	6.47%	1,346	10.80%	4.33

Disability Difference	Child Count Total	Percentage	Survey Responses	Percentage	Percentage Point
Autism	27,711	15.49%	2,939	23.21%	7.72
Deaf-blindness	26	0.01%	19	0.15%	0.14
Developmental delay	14,135	7.90%	1,105	8.73%	-0.83
Emotional disability	8,679	4.85%	556	4.39%	-0.46
Hearing impairment	1,181	0.66%	139	1.10%	0.44
Intellectual disability	8,585	4.80%	611	4.83%	0.03
Multiple disabilities	2,737	1.53%	576	4.55%	3.02
Orthopedic impairment	466	0.26%	51	0.40%	0.14
Other health impairment	35,937	20.09%	1,111	8.77%	-11.32
Specific learning disability	53,733	30.04%	2,345	18.52%	-11.52
Speech or language impairment	24,802	13.86%	1,530	12.08%	-1.78
Traumatic brain injury	364	0.20%	46	0.36%	0.16
Visual impairment	536	0.30%	96	0.76%	0.46

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

Collaboration with organizations, such as the PTI Center and school districts' Parent Resource Centers (PRCs) Coordinators who work directly with parents of students with disabilities, has been a major focus for the VDOE. The VDOE Family Engagement Specialist presented information about the parent survey to these groups and provided strategies for improving response rates and representativeness. Employees from these organizations are asked to share information about the parent survey during their presentations and contact the VDOE family engagement staff members if additional support is needed.

The VDOE family engagement staff members also include information about the parent survey during presentations to families across the State. Special education directors who represent the geographic regions in Virginia and serve on the Special Education and Student Services Council, were also provided with this information and the one-page graphic with suggestions for dissemination. The VDOE Family Engagement Specialist has presented information about the parent survey to the SSEAC and SEACs. Suggestions for ways to improve both response rates and representativeness are included in these presentations.

A downloadable resource and accompanying survey information is accessible via the VDOE's website if needed. In addition, the VDOE Family Engagement Specialist submitted information with the links to access the parent survey to the VDOE's X page while repeating the posts (formerly tweets) often during the last months of the submission window. The VDOE will continue work with the SSEAC, the PTI Center, the school districts' PRCs, and SEACs to further ensure that parents of all students with disabilities across all demographic areas not only have access to the survey but are aware of the importance of their feedback to encourage them to complete the survey.

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 VDOE encourages all parents of students with disabilities across the State to provide feedback via the parent survey. Multiple modalities for survey completion were developed to address the diverse needs of parents in the State. Currently, the survey is available in English and Spanish. A reduced number of paper copies of the parent surveys and postage-paid return envelopes are distributed to parents by school district personnel. An online survey submission option is available via the website link as well as the QR code. The QR code provides ease of access as the parent can quickly scan it using their mobile device and complete the survey.

To increase awareness, to improve parent response rates, and to forge collaborative partnerships with parent organizations, the VDOE's family engagement staff will include information about the parent survey in all presentations given to families, school employees, and other stakeholders. The staff will host Lunch and Learn sessions for Parent Resource Center Coordinators which will focus on empowering families and include strategies for parent survey distribution. This year's process will have an increased focus on the electronic submission to provide greater access for all parents while also providing a more error-proof method of data analysis. Survey dissemination will continue to include the aforementioned method while also including monthly distribution via the VDOE's GovDelivery distribution which is delivered directly to the inboxes of more than 25,000 subscribers. Additionally, the survey information will be included in the statewide IEP system and a copy of the one-page document containing the QR code and direct link to the IEP

will print out at the end of each IEP. The survey information will be distributed via social media using the weekly #FamilyEngagementFriday posts on X (formerly known as Twitter). The family engagement staff will provide targeted technical assistance to special education directors in school divisions with larger numbers of students from underrepresented groups.

To target the underrepresented populations, the VDOE will facilitate two collaborative work sessions with targeted LEA special education directors. The special education directors will be selected based upon the number of students with disabilities in their school divisions who represent these populations. One work session will address the underrepresentation regarding ethnicity (African American/Black and Hispanic) and the other will address underrepresentation in disability categories (Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability).

The VDOE will receive the most recent special education data from the VDOE data analyst to determine which special education directors will be invited to participate in the work sessions. A memo will be drafted to provide notification of this opportunity and select special education directors will receive an invitation to participate in the virtual sessions. Upon acceptance of the invitation, the special education directors will receive additional meeting information.

The two work sessions will focus on increasing the response rates for the identified underrepresented populations. A presentation of the most recent Indicator 8 data will be provided before transitioning to the breakout spaces facilitated by VDOE staff. A discussion around specific focus questions will guide the collaborative sessions and inform next steps. The whole group will reconvene to summarize the discussions and receive a QR code to access a collaborative Padlet to provide any additional feedback. Following the work sessions, VDOE staff will meet to discuss information collected through the work sessions and determine appropriate next steps to be taken by the agency to address these issues of underrepresentation.

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.

The survey responses were analyzed for representativeness by comparing the survey results to the known population parameters for students with IEPs. More specifically, this analysis was completed by comparing the race/ethnicity and primary disability category representation of FFY 2022 parent survey responses to the race/ethnicity and primary disability categories makeup of the state population of all children with disabilities from the VDOE School Year (SY) 2022-2023 IDEA child count.

Based on the seven race/ethnicity categories used to report IDEA data, three of the seven categories (American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander) for survey respondents were within the +/- 3 percentage points of the proportion of the state population of children in those three race/ethnicity categories who are receiving special education services. The White (not Hispanic) and the Two or more race/ethnicity categories were overrepresented by 9.43 percentage points and 4.33 percentage points, respectively. There were mixed results with an overall reduction in nonresponse bias across the other two racial/ethnic categories. The Black or African American race/ethnicity category was underrepresented by -7.56 percentage points. This is a marginal 0.12 percentage point improvement in representativeness, down from -7.68 percentage points in FFY 2021. The Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity category was underrepresented by -7.73 percentage points. This is a 1.16 percentage point regression in representativeness, up from -6.57 percentage points in FFY 2021.

Based on the thirteen disability categories used to report IDEA data, ten of the categories for survey respondents were within the +/- 3 percentage points of the proportion of the state population of children receiving special education services (Deaf-Blindness, Developmental Delay, Emotional Disability, Hearing Impaired, Intellectual Disability, Multiple Disabilities, Orthopedic Impairment, Speech/Language Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury, and Vision Impairment). The Autism category was overrepresented by 7.72 percentage points, an increase in overrepresentation of 3.20 percentage points from 4.52 in FFY 2021. Underrepresentation in two disability categories improved. The Other Health Impairment category was underrepresented by 11.32 percentage points, down from 13.24 in FFY 2021, and the Specific Learning Disability (SLD) category was 11.52 percentage points different than the overall group of students with SLD, down from 12.77 in FFY 2021. This is a year-over-year improvement in representativeness for the Other Health Impairment and SLD categories of 1.92 and 1.25 percentage points, respectively.

The VDOE took multiple steps to reduce previously identified nonresponse bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities. To build awareness about the survey and improve parent response rate, the VDOE Family Engagement Specialist presented information about the parent survey to the Special Education Council including discussions about ways to improve the response rates of parents of children in the underrepresented demographic groups. The VDOE Family Engagement Specialist also presented information about the parent survey to Virginia's SSEAC and local special education advisory committees (SEACs), providing suggestions for ways to improve both response rates and representativeness including suggesting that school districts post the survey information and link on the district website and/or email the survey link to all parents of their students with disabilities.

In FFY 2023, the VDOE is focusing on reducing nonresponse bias by increasing the overall survey response rate. The VDOE Family Engagement Specialist will also explore whether there is a significant difference between those who responded to the survey and those who did not and methods for reducing any nonresponse bias by increasing survey participation of groups who were underrepresented in the FFY 2022 survey respondents. The VDOE Family Engagement Specialist will focus on managing the parent survey process including data collection, analysis, and reporting. The family engagement specialist will continue to work with the Virginia PTI, LEAs, and other stakeholders to increase the response rate and reduce nonresponse bias, and use the parent survey data to assist LEAs with increasing meaningful parent involvement.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	No

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	Yes

Survey Question	Yes / No
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)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

8 - OSEP Response

In its description of strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, the State did not specifically address strategies to increase the response rate for those groups that are underrepresented, as required by the Measurement Table.

8 - Required Actions

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
2020	0.00%

Historical Data - FFY

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.

0

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
7	0	131	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).

The VDOE’s definition of “disproportionate representation” for Indicator 9 is as follows: 1) disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services occurs when the percent of a particular racial or ethnic group identified in the school district’s special education population is disproportionate to the percent of that racial or ethnic group in the school district’s general population using a risk ratio; 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified is a risk ratio of 2.0 or greater; 3) a single year of data is used in the calculation; and 4) a minimum cell size of more than ten (numerator) and minimum n-size of more than ten (denominator) were utilized.

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.

Level One: Data Analysis

The VDOE used a risk ratio model to calculate and determine if districts had disproportionate representation. The VDOE evaluated the degree to which students in specific racial and ethnic groups may or may not be at higher risk for being identified as having a disability compared to students not in those racial and ethnic groups. This is accomplished by computing risk ratios depicting the proportion of students with disabilities in each specific racial and ethnic group relative to the proportion of students with disabilities in all other racial and ethnic groups. The computation was done at the district level, and a minimum cell size of more than ten (numerator) and minimum n-size of more than ten (denominator) was applied as a control for very small populations.

Risk ratios were computed for districts that met the minimum cell size/n-size requirements of more than ten students with disabilities in a specific racial or ethnic group and more than ten students in the comparison group. Data from FFY 2022 includes calculations from all of the 131 school districts in the State, resulting in no districts being totally excluded from the disproportionate calculation. Using the calculation criteria above and applying it to all races/ethnicities effectively created a response group representative of the populations in each district.

Districts with racial and ethnic group(s) that met the minimum cell size/n-size with risk ratios greater than 2.0 were considered to have disproportionate representation. Subsequently, districts were required to complete the level two analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation found was due to procedural violations during the eligibility and/or evaluation processes found at 8VAC20-81-80 and 8VAC20-81-70 of the Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia (Regulations), respectively.

Level Two: Review of Superintendents' Assurances of Policies, Procedures, and Practices that Prevent Disproportionate Representation and Individual Student Records

Annually, each school district is required to provide the VDOE a written assurance, certified by signature of the superintendent, or superintendent's designee, of the school district, that policies and procedures are in effect which are designed to prevent disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity in special education and related services.

Additionally, if a school district was identified in the level one analysis for disproportionate representation, the district was required to review individual student records for the racial and ethnic groups identified in the level one analysis. This record review required the use of a checklist that allowed the school district to identify, by documented evidence only, any violations of procedural or regulatory requirements related to the identification of students as a student with a disability. If there was no documented evidence found in a student's record to support "appropriate identification" as defined by the VDOE, this counted as a procedural or regulatory violation. School districts submitted a written summary of their student record review to the VDOE, and a final determination was made as to which districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. For 2022-2023, zero of the seven districts identified in the level one analysis and subjected to this level two analysis were determined to have violations of regulatory or procedural requirements related to the identification of students as students with disabilities in that racial or ethnic group.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 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
2020	1.72%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.72%	0.86%	1.71%	0.87%	0.85%

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.

13

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
44	4	118	0.85%	0%	3.39%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage for indicator 10 may be, in part, attributed to the academic losses experienced during the pandemic which, even with the use of interventions and supports upon return to in person learning had disproportionate results for certain populations. These academic challenges post-pandemic impacted certain groups at a higher rate than others. This exacerbated gaps for students who may have been achieving successfully with school-based supports and interventions prior to the pandemic but resulted an increase in the number of referrals for the population identified. Training and technical assistance staff in addition, VDOE monitoring staff have placed more emphasis on ensuring that the eligibility processes are strictly enforced, as is required from the Virginia Regulations. The areas of noncompliance related to the use of Virginia's eligibility criteria, assessing students in all areas related to the

suspected disability, implementing the eligibility procedure as required, and using a variety of resources in decision making are areas being stressed to LEAs to ensure that disproportionality is reduced in Virginia.

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).

The VDOE’s definition of “disproportionate representation” for Indicator 10 is as follows: 1) disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories occurs when the percent of a particular racial or ethnic group in the disability categories of intellectual disability, specific learning disability, emotional disability, other health impairment, autism, or speech or language impairment is disproportionate to the percent of that racial or ethnic group relative to the percent of students with disabilities in these disability categories in all other racial or ethnic groups using a risk ratio; 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified as a risk ratio of 2.0 or greater; 3) a single year of data is used in the calculation; and 4) a minimum cell size of more than ten (numerator) and/or minimum n-size of more than ten (denominator) were utilized.

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.

Level One: Data Analysis

The VDOE used a risk ratio model to calculate and determine if districts had disproportionate representation. The VDOE evaluated the degree to which students in specific racial and ethnic groups may or may not be at higher risk for being identified as having a disability in a specific disability category compared to students not in that racial or ethnic group. This is accomplished by computing risk ratios depicting the proportion of students with disabilities in a specific disability category in each racial and ethnic group relative to the proportion of students with disabilities in the specific disability category in all other racial and ethnic groups. The computation was done at the district level. A minimum cell size of more than ten (numerator) and minimum n-size of more than ten (denominator) was applied to control very small populations.

Risk ratios were computed for districts that met the minimum cell size/n-size requirements of more than ten students with disabilities in the racial or ethnic group and more than ten students in the comparison group. Districts with racial and ethnic group(s) that met the minimum cell size/n-size with risk ratios 2.0 or greater were considered to have disproportionate representation and required to complete the level two analysis to determine if the disproportionate representation found was due to procedural violations during the eligibility and/or evaluation processes found at 8VAC20-81-80 and 8VAC20-81-70 of the Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia (Regulations), respectively.

In 2022-2023, 13 districts were totally excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum cell size requirements for any racial or ethnic group within specific disability categories. Forty-four districts were identified in the level one analysis and subjected to level two analysis. The FFY 2022 data includes calculations from 118 school districts and captures all races and ethnicities as well as all six specific disability categories, creating a response group representative of the populations in each district.

Level Two: Review of Superintendents’ Assurances of Policies, Procedures, and Practices that Prevent Disproportionate Representation and Individual Student Records

Annually, each school district is required to provide the VDOE a written assurance, certified by signature of the superintendent or superintendent’s designee of the school district, that policies and procedures are in effect which are designed to prevent disproportionate representation in special education and related services by race and ethnicity within specific disability categories.

Additionally, if a district was identified in the level one analysis for disproportionate representation, the district was required to review individual student records for the racial and ethnic group(s) and special education category(ies) identified in the level one analysis. This record review required the use of a checklist that allowed the district to identify, by documented evidence only, any violations of procedural or regulatory requirements related to the identification of a student as a “student with a disability.” If there was no documented evidence found in a student’s record to support “appropriate identification” as defined by the VDOE, this counted as a procedural or regulatory violation. School districts submitted a written summary of their student record review to VDOE, and a final determination was made as to which districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification. For 2022-2023, four of the forty-four districts identified in the level one analysis and subjected to this level two analysis were determined to have violations of regulatory or procedural requirements related to the identification of students as students with disabilities in that racial and ethnic group and specific disability category(ies).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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	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

The VDOE provided written notification of noncompliance to the district that reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2021 and assigned a VDOE monitoring specialist. The assigned monitoring specialist reviewed the district’s procedures and practices for compliance. Finding zero noncompliance in the aforementioned areas, the district then provided training/technical assistance to its applicable staff members. Therefore, it was determined that no additional corrective steps were required by the district. The FFY 2021 district that reported noncompliance specific to Indicator 10 is now at 100 percent compliance and correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The VDOE has verified that the individual incident of student-level noncompliance specific to Indicator 10 from the school district identified in FFY 2021 was correct consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. The district with noncompliance has corrected their individual case of noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements associated with Indicator 10. Prior to conducting a review of the student-specific noncompliance, the VDOE monitoring specialist reviewed the processes used by the district to identify students under IDEA, more specifically the six specific disability categories identified under Indicator 10, to determine if the district’s eligibility and evaluation processes were compliant. This review also included an assessment as to whether there was racial/ethnic and/or cultural bias(es) in the district’s processes. Additionally, the eligibility and evaluation processes were reviewed to discern if the identified noncompliance was a districtwide problem, a school-based problem, or an isolated occurrence. It was determined that the school district’s identification processes were compliant and that the identified case of noncompliance was isolated.

To complete the student-specific process, the VDOE monitoring specialists reassessed the record of the individual case of noncompliance and verified that the individual record was corrected, and therefore 100 percent compliant. To satisfy systemic concerns, the VDOE monitoring specialist reviewed the district’s policies and procedures (e.g., documentation of training, meetings, guidance documents, procedural updates) implemented since noncompliance was identified. The monitor then randomly reviewed new student files (systemic) for the identified disproportionately represented race/ethnicity and disability in the noncompliant district, reviewing for evidence of corrections in the part of their processes that caused the noncompliance. The new records reviewed resulted in 100 percent compliance, and it was determined that no additional corrective steps were required by the district. All steps took place within one calendar year of the date the district was notified of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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

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 each district with noncompliance: (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.

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

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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
2005	92.70%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.25%	98.85%	97.45%	93.66%	97.78%

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
35,338	34,632	97.78%	100%	98.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

706

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.

Number of students / (Range of business days beyond required timeline)

- 267 students (1–5 days)
- 210 students (6–15 days)
- 79 students (16–25 days)
- 55 students (26–35 days)
- 26 students (36–45 days)
- 69 students (46+ days)

Number of students / (Reason for the delay)

- 247 students (Paperwork errors)
- 158 students (staffing issues)
- 142 students (scheduling issues)
- 80 students (assessment not completed on time)
- 38 students (Child not available: not parent failure/child refusal)
- 17 students (human error)
- 6 students (Late referral due to Part B/C issues)
- 6 students (Inconclusive testing results)
- 1 students (Inclement weather)
- 11 students (other)

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).

According to Virginia Regulations, 8VAC20-81-60 referral for initial evaluation, the school district must ensure that all evaluations are completed and that decisions about eligibility are made within 65 business days of the receipt of the referral by the special education administrator, or designee, including if the special education administrator, or designee, routes the referral to the school-based committee for review and action.

The time frame shall not apply to the local school district if:

- (1) The parent(s) of the child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or

- (2) If the child enrolls in a school served by the local school district after the required 65 business days has begun and prior to a determination by the child's previous local school district as to whether the child is a child with a disability. This exception only applies if the local school district is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation and the parent(s) and the local school district where the child is enrolled in school agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

In addition, the parent and eligibility group may agree in writing to extend the 65-day timeline to obtain additional data that cannot be obtained within the 65 business days.

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 school districts submitted data for Indicator 11 through a secure web-based application developed by VDOE. All components of Indicator 11 are included in the application, and data entered reflect the reporting period July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023, including edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy in reporting. The VDOE staff members provided information to school district staff members regarding the data required for Indicator 11 and on procedures for submitting data to the VDOE through statewide training sessions. Data submitted by school districts were reviewed for accuracy by VDOE staff members, and school districts were notified when there appeared to be inaccurate reporting.

In addition, numerous verification visits were made to ensure accurate reporting. Specifically, the VDOE uses a five-year cyclical approach to review special education data for all school districts in the State, as recommended by OSEP. In doing so, the VDOE has a process for systematically auditing and validating school districts' self-determinations of compliance with all IDEA compliance indicators submitted through its SSWS Special Education Indicators Application. The VDOE ensures, per OSEP guidance, all instances of noncompliance are reported as communicated by the LEAs to VDOE consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Each year, approximately 20 percent of the school districts in Virginia are selected for data validation of compliance indicators. Specifically, between the months of September and December, the regional VDOE monitoring specialist assigned to school districts within that current year's cohort reviews a random sample of individual student files and specific policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the accuracy of the indicator information submitted to VDOE. The number of files reviewed is based on the number of records submitted for each indicator. The LEAs self-reporting less than 100 percent receive written notification of noncompliance, develop a corrective action plan (CAP) as determined by the VDOE monitoring specialist, and undergo the student-specific and systemic process within one year of written notification. If it is determined that LEAs self-reporting 100 percent submitted inaccurate information, then the school district is required to resubmit accurately. Following data resubmission, the district superintendent receives written notification of noncompliance, a CAP is developed as determined by the VDOE monitoring specialist, and the student-specific and systemic process is completed within one year of written notification. Closure of indicator corrections is finalized with an email to special education administrators.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2022, a total of 706 student-level findings of noncompliance with Indicator 11 were identified across 39 school districts. The status of compliance will be reported in the next APR report.

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
708	708	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*

The FFY 2021 data reflected 708 total instances of noncompliance in 39 school districts. The assigned VDOE monitoring specialist contacted each of the 39 school districts that reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2021. A discussion of activities, strategies, and barriers causing noncompliance was held with the director of special education, or the designee, for each of the 39 school districts. Directors of special education followed up with school administrators and other staff members integral to the evaluation and eligibility processes to ensure the implementation of activities and strategies discussed with the VDOE monitoring specialist. A random sampling of newly completed Indicator 11 records (systemic) in each of the 39 districts identified as noncompliant for this indicator in FFY 2021 were reviewed by the VDOE monitoring specialist through in-person or remote desk audits. The results of these (child-specific) and (systemic) reviews revealed that all of the 39 districts previously identified as noncompliant for Indicator 11 in FFY 2021 are now at 100 percent compliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The VDOE has determined that all of the 708 instances of student-level noncompliance specific to Indicator 11 identified in FFY 2021 were corrected consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Each of the 39 districts with noncompliance: 1) has completed the eligibility, although late, for any child whose initial eligibility was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district; and 2) the VDOE has verified that the district is now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements with 100 percent compliance.

Specifically, written notification of the noncompliance was sent to each of the 39 district superintendents; a VDOE monitoring specialist was assigned to each district; and CAPs were written by the district, if deemed appropriate by the VDOE monitoring specialist. To satisfy the student-specific noncompliance, in-person or remote desk reviews were completed for each of the 708 individual student records in the 39 districts that were identified as noncompliant for Indicator 11 in FFY 2021. The VDOE monitoring specialist reviewed the eligibility determinations for each of the 708 individual cases of noncompliance and has determined that the LEA has completed, although late, the eligibility for any child whose initial eligibility was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, resulting in 100 percent compliance with the regulatory requirement. At the time of this review, VDOE monitoring specialists reminded local directors of their obligation to consider compensatory service for eligible students in instances where the timeline was not met. To ensure systemic compliance, the VDOE monitoring specialists reviewed revised policies, procedures, and practices (e.g., documentation of training, meetings, handbook update, guidance documents) the districts have implemented since noncompliance was identified. As stated above, a random sampling of newly completed Indicator 11 records in each of the 39 districts identified as noncompliant for this indicator in FFY 2021 were reviewed by the VDOE. The results of these reviews revealed that all of the 39 districts previously identified as noncompliant in FFY 2021 for Indicator 11, are now at 100 percent compliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. All steps took place within one calendar year of the date each district was notified of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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

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. 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

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

- 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
2005	89.30%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.56%	99.70%	99.47%	95.26%	97.89%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

FFY2022	Number
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,898
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	407
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,663
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.	528
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	255
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.	2,663	2,708	97.89%	100%	98.34%	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

45

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.

Number of students with disabilities / (Range of business days beyond required timeline)

- 6 students (1–5 days)
- 8 students (6–15 days)
- 3 students (16–25 days)
- 2 students (26–35 days)
- 6 students (36–45 days)
- 18 students (46+ days)

Number of students with disabilities / (Reason for the delay)

- 0 students (Inclement weather)
- 21 students (Paperwork errors)
- 0 students (Inconclusive testing results)
- 10 students (Late referral due to Part B/C issues)
- 2 students (Child not available: not parent failure/child refusal)
- 12 students (Other) - Specifically, All 12 meeting delays due to scheduling errors on behalf of the school districts.

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.

All school districts submitted data for Indicator 12 through a secure web-based application developed by VDOE. All components of Indicator 12 are included in the application and data entered reflect the reporting period July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023, and include all children referred by Part C prior to age three who are found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by the beginning of the school year if they turn age two by September 30 of that school year or by their third birthday. Staff members from VDOE provided information related to data required for Indicator 12 and on procedures for submitting data to VDOE through statewide training sessions. Data submitted by school districts were reviewed for accuracy, and school districts were notified when there appeared to be inaccurate reporting.

In addition, numerous verification visits were made to ensure accurate reporting. Specifically, the VDOE uses a five-year cyclical approach to review special education data for all school districts in the State, as recommended by OSEP. In doing so, the VDOE has a process for systematically auditing and validating school districts’ self-determinations of compliance with all IDEA compliance indicators submitted through its SSWS Special Education Indicators Application. The VDOE ensures, per OSEP guidance, all instances of noncompliance are reported as communicated by the LEAs to VDOE consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Each year, approximately 20 percent of the school districts in Virginia are selected for data validation of compliance indicators. Specifically, between the months of September and December, the regional VDOE monitoring specialist assigned to school districts within that current year’s cohort reviews a random sample of individual student files and specific policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the accuracy of the indicator information submitted to VDOE. The number of files reviewed is based on the number of records submitted for each indicator. The LEAs self-reporting less than 100 percent receive written notification of noncompliance, develop a CAP as determined by the VDOE Lead Monitoring Specialist, and undergo ensuring child-specific compliance and systemic compliance within one year of written notification. If it is determined that LEAs self-reporting 100 percent submitted inaccurate information, then the school district is required to resubmit accurately. Following data resubmission, the district superintendent receives written notification of noncompliance, a CAP is developed as determined by the VDOE Lead Monitoring Specialist, and the LEA has corrected all identified child-specific noncompliance and is now correctly implementing the regulations systemically within one year of written notification. Closure of indicator corrections is finalized with an email to special education administrators.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2022, a total of 45 student-level findings of noncompliance with Indicator 12 were identified across 15 school districts. The status of compliance will be reported in the next APR report.

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
52	52	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

The FFY 2021 data reflected 52 total instances of noncompliance in 16 school districts. The assigned VDOE monitoring specialist contacted each of the 16 school districts that reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2021. A discussion of activities, strategies, and barriers causing noncompliance was held with the director of special education, or the designee, for each of the 16 school districts. Directors of special education followed up with school administrators and other staff members integral to the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP processes to ensure the implementation of activities and strategies discussed with the VDOE monitoring specialist. A random sampling of newly completed Indicator 12 records (systemic) in each of the 16 districts identified as noncompliant for this indicator in FFY 2021 were reviewed by the VDOE monitoring specialist through in-person or remote desk audits. The results of these (child-specific) and (systemic) reviews revealed that all of the 16 districts previously identified as noncompliant for Indicator 12 in FFY 2021 are now at 100 percent compliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

The VDOE has determined that all of the 52 instances of student-level noncompliance specific to Indicator 12 identified in FFY 2021 were corrected consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Each of the 16 districts with noncompliance 1) has completed the eligibility and developed an initial IEP, although late, for any child whose initial eligibility and subsequent IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district; and 2) the VDOE has verified that the district is now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements with 100 percent compliance.

Specifically, written notification of the noncompliance was sent to each of the 16 district superintendents; a VDOE monitoring specialist was assigned to each district; and CAPs were written by the district, if deemed appropriate by the VDOE monitoring specialist. To satisfy the student-specific noncompliance, in-person or remote desk reviews were completed for each of the 52 individual student records in the 16 districts that were identified as noncompliant for Indicator 12 in FFY 2021. The VDOE monitoring specialist reviewed the eligibility determinations and IEP for each of the 52 individual cases of noncompliance and has determined that the LEA has completed, although late, the eligibility and IEP for any child whose initial eligibility and subsequent IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, resulting in 100 percent compliance with the regulatory requirement. At the time of this review, VDOE monitoring specialists reminded local directors of their obligation to consider compensatory service for eligible students in instances where the timeline was not met. To ensure systemic compliance, the VDOE monitoring specialists reviewed revised policies, procedures, and practices (e.g., documentation of training, meetings, handbook update, guidance documents) the districts have implemented since noncompliance was identified. As stated above, a random sampling of newly completed Indicator 12 records in each of the 16 districts identified as

noncompliant for this indicator in FFY 2021 were reviewed by the VDOE. The results of these reviews revealed that all of the 16 districts previously identified as noncompliant in FFY 2021 for Indicator 12 are now at 100 percent compliance and are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. All steps took place within one calendar year of the date each district was notified of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

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
2009	98.09%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.71%	99.25%	98.41%	97.15%	95.58%

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
7,925	8,244	95.58%	100%	96.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 school districts complete an eight-question checklist developed by VDOE that incorporates technical assistance provided by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT). The data is submitted through a secure web-based application developed by VDOE. All required components of Indicator 13 are included in the application, and data entered reflect the reporting period July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023, including edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy in reporting. Staff members from VDOE provided information related to data required for Indicator 13 and on procedures for submitting data to the VDOE through statewide training sessions. Data submitted by school districts were reviewed for accuracy, and school districts were notified when there appeared to be inaccurate reporting.

In addition, numerous verification visits were made to ensure accurate reporting. Specifically, the VDOE uses a five-year cyclical approach to review special education data for all school districts in the State, as recommended by OSEP. In doing so, the VDOE has a process for systematically auditing and validating school districts’ self-determinations of compliance with all IDEA compliance indicators submitted through its SSWS Special Education Indicators Application. The VDOE ensures, per OSEP guidance, all instances of noncompliance are reported as communicated by the LEAs to VDOE consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Each year, approximately 20 percent of the school districts in Virginia are selected for data validation of compliance indicators. Specifically, between the months of September and December, the regional VDOE monitoring specialist assigned to school districts within that current year’s cohort reviews a random sample of individual student files and specific policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the accuracy of the indicator information submitted to VDOE. The number of files reviewed is based on the number of records submitted for each indicator. The LEAs self-reporting less than 100 percent receive written notification of noncompliance, develop a CAP as determined by the VDOE Lead Monitoring Specialist, and undergo the student-specific and systemic process within one year of written notification. If it is determined that LEAs self-reporting 100 percent submitted inaccurate information, then the school district is required to resubmit accurately. Following data resubmission, the district superintendent receives written notification of noncompliance, a CAP is developed as determined by the VDOE Lead Monitoring Specialist, and the student-specific and systemic process is completed within one year of written notification. Closure of indicator corrections is finalized with an email to special education administrators.

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?	No

If no, please explain

Although State regulations require transition planning to start at age 14, VDOE staff members met with stakeholders and elected to align the Indicator 13 data submission with Federal regulations as required in the FFY 2022 Part B Measurement Table. This decision was made to align with Federal regulations in order to minimize the variables for benchmarking purposes when utilizing the SPP/APR Indicator Analysis Booklet released annually by OSEP. The NTACT analysis of Indicator 13 is very useful when meeting with stakeholders. However, Federal program monitoring specialists ensure that students younger than age 16 also meet these requirements as identified by Virginia Regulations in their monitoring activities conducted in local districts. Virginia will revisit the decision to not include children younger than age 16 in our stakeholder discussions for the FFY 2023 Part B SPP/APR and beyond.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2022, a total of 319 student-level findings of noncompliance with Indicator 13 were identified across 25 school districts. The status of compliance will be reported in the next APR report.

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
365	365	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

The FFY 2021 data reflected 365 total instances of noncompliance in 22 school districts for FFY 2021. Written notification of the noncompliance was sent to each of the 22 district superintendents, a VDOE monitoring specialist was assigned, and CAPs were written by the districts if deemed appropriate by the VDOE monitoring specialist. To satisfy the systemic regulatory requirements process, the VDOE monitoring specialist reviewed revised policies, procedures, and practices (e.g., documentation of trainings, meetings, handbook update, guidance documents) the district has implemented since noncompliance was identified. Monitors then randomly selected new files for review that were completed following changes to policies, procedures, and practices reviewing for evidence of corrections in the part or parts of the process that caused the noncompliance. If the initial set of files did not result in 100 percent compliance, additional corrective steps were implemented by the district, and additional files are reviewed. This continued as necessary to

result in 100 percent compliance. All steps took place within one calendar year of the date the district was notified of noncompliance. The VDOE's procedure for corrections of noncompliance and verification of implementation of the specific regulatory requirement is consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

As stated above, written notification of the noncompliance was sent to each of the 22 district superintendents; a VDOE monitoring specialist was assigned to each district; and CAPs were written by the district, if deemed appropriate by the VDOE monitoring specialist. To satisfy the student-specific noncompliance, in-person or remote desk reviews were completed for each of the 365 individual student records in the 22 districts that were identified as noncompliant for Indicator 13 in FFY 2021. A VDOE monitoring specialist reviewed each IEP that was out of compliance to ensure the noncompliance has been corrected. The VDOE staff has determined that all of the 365 items of student-level noncompliance specific to Indicator 13, identified in FFY 2021, were corrected consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. Each district with noncompliance findings has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021 (Blank cells indicate data is Not Applicable.)

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

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

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 >=	36.00%	36.00%	35.00%	35.50%	36.00%
A	31.93%	Data	32.57%	34.87%	34.44%	33.32%	35.32%
B	2009	Target >=	63.50%	63.50%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%
B	54.95%	Data	64.08%	66.11%	65.87%	71.65%	73.90%
C	2009	Target >=	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.50%	73.00%
C	63.32%	Data	73.39%	74.34%	73.66%	77.60%	80.41%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	36.50%	37.00%	37.50%	38.00%
Target B >=	66.50%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C >=	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

FFY 2022	Number
Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	11,274
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,161
Response Rate	63.52%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,606
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,585
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)	220
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).	292

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)	2,606	7,161	35.32%	36.50%	36.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	5,191	7,161	73.90%	66.50%	72.49%	Met target	No Slippage

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
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)	5,703	7,161	80.41%	73.50%	79.64%	Met target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	60.73%	63.52%

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

To deem the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, Virginia chose to analyze primary disability and race/ethnicity as the demographics using a +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group. The results of the analysis showed completed surveys were within less than a +/- 1.0 percentage point discrepancy in most demographic areas by primary disability and race/ethnicity. A few outliers were well within the +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy threshold when compared to all exiters in the census population.

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.

To deem 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, Virginia chose to analyze primary disability and race/ethnicity as the demographics using a +/- 3 percentage point threshold in the proportion of responders compared to the target group. The results of the analysis showed completed surveys were within a +/- less than 1.0 percentage point discrepancy in most demographic areas by primary disability and race/ethnicity. A few outliers were well within the +/- 3 percentage point discrepancy threshold when compared to all exiters in the census population.

Note: The less than symbol in the next two tables indicate data that is 10 or less.

Disability	All Exiters	Percentage	Completed Surveys	Percentage	Percentage Point Difference
Autism	1,397	12.39%	947	13.22%	-0.83%
Deaf-blindness	<	0.05%	<	0.08%	-0.03%
Emotional disability	1,060	9.40%	599	8.36%	1.04%
Hearing impairment	81	0.72%	64	0.89%	-0.17%
Intellectual disability	737	6.54%	496	6.93%	-0.39%
Multiple disabilities	218	1.93%	140	1.96%	-0.03%
Orthopedic impairment	30	0.27%	17	0.24%	0.03%
Other health impairment	2,884	25.58%	1,871	26.13%	-0.55%
Specific learning disability	4,611	40.90%	2,864	39.99%	0.91%
Speech or language impairment	122	1.08%	70	0.98%	0.10%
Traumatic brain injury	40	0.35%	26	0.36%	-0.01%
Visual impairment	65	0.58%	47	0.66%	-0.08%
Child with a Disability	23	0.20%	14	0.20%	0.00%

Race/Ethnicity Difference	Child Count Total	Percentage	Survey Responses	Percentage	Percentage Point
American Indian/Alaska Native	69	0.61%	47	0.66%	-0.05%
Asian	359	3.18%	198	2.76%	0.42%
Black or African American	3,260	28.92%	2,033	28.39%	0.53%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	17	0.15%	<	0.10%	0.05%
Hispanic/Latino	1,662	14.74%	963	13.45%	1.29%
White (not Hispanic)	5,314	47.14%	3,580	49.99%	-2.85%
Two or more races	503	4.46%	300	4.19%	0.27%
Unspecified	90	0.80%	33	0.46%	0.34%

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.

The State of Virginia is using several strategies to increase the response rate year after year. The VDOE works closely with their state-funded transition center to distribute information and training through their website on collecting and utilizing Indicator 14 data. A webpage is devoted to Indicator 14, including recordings of question and answer sessions held through Zoom meetings for school districts to attend and to have answered any questions they might have; tips are provided on how to increase a school district's response rate; and information on implementing Indicator 14 and submitting follow-up data. The recording of the Indicator 14 training for those assigned by their special education director is available online for those who collect the data to watch at anytime (on demand). In addition, any staff or interested person can watch this recording. Contact information is readily available through both VDOE's website and the Center on Transition Innovations' (CTI's) website concerning the collection of postsecondary data. In addition staff are working directly with special education directors through trainings on using the data for transition planning. There is also an online manual that describes how to utilize the data to make improvements through the use of stakeholder input. The VDOE staff members will work directly with transition personnel on Indicator 14 (e.g., sharing information, providing training) through Communities of Practice that are established in regions across the State.

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.

To ensure minimal nonresponse bias, the school districts employed a variety of efforts to follow the prescribed protocol and reach all students and families. Districts will often reach out to community agencies for current contact information when needed; districts made multiple attempts using all phone numbers on record to contact each family, calling at different days and different times. The Virginia sample demographics were so similar to the population (all exiters) demographics (by disability and by race/ethnicity) that no propensity matching or other statistical adjustments were needed.

The response rate was 63.52 percent. The sampling error was <1 (less than one) percent at a 95 percent confidence level with a population of 11,274 students with disabilities and completed surveys of 7,161 respondents. The responders are representative in terms of their disability category and race/ethnicity. The phi coefficient (f) comparing responders to nonresponders was found to be small for disability category (f=0.031) and race/ethnicity (f=0.022).

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?	No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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 (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline 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 is 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	60
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	19

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

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	27.00%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	34.00%-39.00%	34.00%-39.00%
Data	32.26%	13.79%	40.43%	51.85%	14.10%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	34.00%	39.00%	34.00%	39.00%	34.00%	39.00%	34.00%	39.00%

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 (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
19	60	14.10%	34.00%	39.00%	31.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of 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 is 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	103
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	10
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	52

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

During the development of Virginia’s Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	75.00%

Historical Data - FFY

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	76.00% - 80.00%	76.00% - 80.00%	76.00%-80.00%	76.00%-80.00%	76.00%-80.00%
Data	77.01%	71.03%	75.34%	73.97%	56.38%

Targets

FFY	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	76.00%	80.00%	76.00%	80.00%	76.00%	80.00%	76.00%	80.00%

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 (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
10	52	103	56.38%	76.00%	80.00%	60.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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)?

Virginia will focus on improving the graduation rate for students with disabilities identified with specific learning disabilities (SLD), other health impairment (OHI), emotional disability (ED), and/or intellectual disability (ID) by reducing the non-graduating rate with a regular high school diploma by ten percent from the previous year.

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)

Yes

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The data is extracted as a subset from Virginia's End-of-Year and Summer Student Record Collection (SRC). It is an annual graduation rate of students with disabilities graduating within the year. The data extracted from school districts are compiled into a statewide number of students with disabilities identified with an ED, ID, OHI, or a SLD projected to receive a regular high school diploma (numerator). That number is divided by all exiters with the above listed primary disabilities that left school with a state-defined diploma or certificate (denominator) to generate a statewide rate of graduation for students identified with a primary disability of ED, ID, OHI, or SLD who receive a regular high school diploma

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://www.doe.virginia.gov/programs-services/special-education/reports-plans-statistics/special-education-performance-report-2019-2020> (scroll to 2019-2020 State Performance Report) - SSIP Page 8; Appendix A

Current Theory of Action

The VDOE continues to utilize the Theory of Action to the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) as a conceptual approach to realizing Virginia's SiMR of an increased graduation rate for students with disabilities with a standard or advanced studies diploma. The Theory of Action guides or frames behaviors within each layer of a cascading model of prevention and intervention supports in order to ensure long-term positive outcomes for greater numbers of students with disabilities within the State. A cascading model of supports is defined as a statewide system for effectively and efficiently promoting the application of data collection and analysis strategies, evidence-based practices (EBPs), and key systems to sustain change based on implementation science. In this model, the State provides key resources to school districts. The districts utilize these resources in ways that are contextually appropriate in order for teachers to apply new instructional habits for improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Across the VDOE, there has been much agreement or alignment on the outcomes of each layer of this cascade (provide, utilize, apply, and improve). A significant milestone for this year is the initial implementation of a cascading system aligned in process within each layer as well as through the cascade. While outcomes have been aligned, the "how" and "what" of accomplishing each outcome varied widely resulting in limited or inconsistent results for students with disabilities.

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
2013	54.90%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	81.56%	83.40%	85.06%	86.55%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total Federal Graduation Indicator in ED, ID OHI, SLD	Total Exiters in ED, ID, OHI, SLD with a State Defined Diploma or Certificate	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
7,840	9,542	81.41%	81.56%	82.16%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

The data is extracted as a subset from Virginia's End-of-Year and Summer Student Record Collection (SRC). It is an annual graduation rate of students with disabilities graduating within the year

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

As described above, The data is extracted as a subset from Virginia's End-of-Year and Summer Student Record Collection (SRC). It is an annual graduation rate of students with disabilities graduating within the year. The data extracted from school districts are compiled into a statewide number of students with disabilities identified with an emotional disability (ED), intellectual disability (ID), other health impairment (OHI), or a specific learning disability (SLD) projected to receive a regular high school diploma (numerator). That number is divided by all exiters with the above listed primary disabilities that left school with a state-defined diploma or certificate (denominator) to generate a statewide rate of graduation for students identified with a primary disability of ED, ID, OHI, or SLD who receive a regular high school diploma.

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.

The VDOE continues to utilize the Theory of Action to the SSIP as a conceptual approach to realizing Virginia's SiMR of an increased graduation rate for students with disabilities with a standard or advanced studies diploma. The Theory of Action is guided by priority outcomes reached by stakeholder consensus using key data points. To assess these priority outcomes, the VDOE collects the percentage of students with disabilities that pass the eighth-grade English reading and math Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments; the number of disciplinary actions (i.e., office discipline referrals, in-school suspensions, and out-of-school suspensions) for students with disabilities; and the number of students with disabilities who miss more than ten days of instruction in a school year.

Specifically, the academic goal, set by VDOE stakeholders as a priority outcome, is to increase the number of students with disabilities who pass the eighth-grade English reading and math SOL assessments. These goals are based on the data that indicate students with emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities who pass the eighth-grade English reading and/or math SOL assessments are more likely than their peers to graduate with a standard or advanced studies diploma. The academic goals are to 1) increase the percentage of students with disabilities that pass the eighth-grade English reading SOL assessment, 2) increase the percentage of students with disabilities that pass the eighth-grade math SOL assessment, 3) increase the percentage of students with disabilities that pass either the eighth-grade English reading SOL or math SOL assessment, and 4) increase the percentage of students with disabilities that pass both eighth-grade English reading SOL and math SOL assessments.

The behavioral goal, set by VDOE stakeholders as a priority outcome, is to reduce the number of disciplinary actions for students with disabilities. This goal is based on the hypothesis that lower incidents of disciplinary actions for students with emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities in a school year are likely to increase the rates of graduating with a standard or advanced studies diploma. The discipline goals are to 1) reduce the average rate of office discipline referrals (ODRs) per ten students with disabilities, 2) reduce the average rate of in-school suspensions (ISSs) per ten students with disabilities, and 3) reduce the average rate of out-of-school suspensions (OSSs) per ten students with disabilities.

The attendance goal, set by VDOE stakeholders as a priority outcome, is to reduce the number of students with disabilities who miss more than ten days of instruction in a school year. This goal is based on the hypothesis that students with emotional disabilities, intellectual disabilities, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities that miss less than ten days of school in a school year are more likely to graduate with a standard or advanced studies diploma.

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.

Some districts and schools experienced typical obstacles with monitoring data including personnel turnover and transitions to different systems for tracking academic and discipline data. Districts and schools handled these obstacles internally, collaborating with VTSS for support and/or extensions as they worked to enter data into the VTSS Data Collection System.

During the 2022-2023 academic year, districts and schools experienced high turnover rates. Turnover possibly impacted data completeness, validity, and reliability by putting stress on district and school resources and having people naive to data collection processes/procedures being at least partially responsible in data collection/submission in the classroom, school, and/or district levels. Steps addressing data quality concerns included extensions in data submission timelines, providing additional support to help facilitate data submission, and allowing some data submissions by email after the VTSS data collection portal had transitioned to the next data collection period. Checks are done to assess possible inconsistencies. Schools and districts along with the VTSS Systems Coaches who support them are made aware of data quality concerns and impact on analysis. When able, correct data are submitted.

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.

In the previous section, we discussed the impact of high teacher turnover rates on data completeness, validity, and reliability. COVID-19 has contributed to the high teacher turnover as current rates are higher than pre-pandemic rates. Teacher turnover impacts data completeness, validity, and reliability as new personnel may not be fully trained on data collection/submission processes and procedures. Steps to mitigate obstacles included extensions in data submission timelines, providing additional support to help facilitate data submission, and allowing some data submissions by email after the VTSS data collection portal had transitioned to the next data collection period. Checks are done to assess possible inconsistencies. Schools and districts along with the VTSS Systems Coaches who support them are made aware of data quality concerns and impact on analysis. When able, correct data are submitted.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://www.doe.virginia.gov/programs-services/special-education/reports-plans-statistics/special-education-performance-report-2019-2020> - (scroll to 2019-2020 State Performance Report) - SSIP Page 49

Current Evaluation Plan

It was determined, through stakeholder input, to continue with the current evaluation activities for the year, including the use of multiple data sources and analyses that will allow the evaluation on progress made towards meeting the projected targets. State, district, and school data will be analyzed over time with comparisons made to their baseline measures to determine improvements. Using a discrepancy evaluation model will allow participating districts and schools to develop individualized goals and determine the degree to which those goals were accomplished.

Evaluation activities include professional learning event evaluations; implementation measures; and student outcomes (academic, discipline, attendance, and graduation). Professional learning evaluation data will be collected from attendees at the end of each training session. The VTSS collects district and school data twice a year during Midyear and End-of-Year. Measures collected during Midyear are the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) for districts and Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI) for schools. Measures collected during End-of-Year are the Family Engagement Survey, Level of Satisfaction, and Value of Resources for districts and student enrollment and discipline (Office Discipline Referrals, In-School Suspensions, and Out-of-School Suspensions) for schools. Additionally, student behavioral and academic outcomes and school climate data will be collected at the end of each academic year by the State. Student behavioral and academic outcomes will be disaggregated by race/ethnicity and disability (SWD) to assess outcomes for high-need students.

Data will be analyzed and reports generated for state, district, and school leadership teams and VTSS Systems Coaches as part of the feedback loop. Outcomes will be evaluated to see if improvement/gains were made compared to baseline and longitudinally. Relative risks will be used to assess disparities for students with disabilities and ethnicity/race subgroups. Correlations will be used to determine if statistically significant relationships exist between student behavioral outcomes, student academic outcomes, school implementation fidelity, and school climate. Qualitative data such as training and technical assistance participant evaluations, coaching logs, focus group conversations, and social validity survey respondents will be examined to provide guidance in the refinement of the VTSS framework.

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:

Virginia continued to emphasize the use of implementation science as outlined by the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN). To implement and sustain the long-term changes that will create the necessary context for eliminating achievement gaps in attendance, discipline, and academics for students with disabilities, as outlined in the SSIP, both (i) coherent improvement strategies and (ii) subsequent principal activities were implemented at the systems level. It is important to note that all infrastructure improvement strategies during this reporting period continue to be refined as we further learn the extent of the long-term impact from the pandemic. The coherent system's improvement strategies are categorized into those made to the three drivers of change, as outlined by NIRN: Leadership, Organization, and Competency.

LEADERSHIP DRIVER. The VTSS State Educational Agency Lead resumed meetings with the VDOE's Office of School Quality (OSQ) to maximize understanding of the processes and procedures from each department as well as establish a communication loop to promote consistency and align the work to benefit the districts. In consideration of lessons learned from the pandemic, teaming structures continue to adapt to the changing context. For example, at the district and school levels, individuals with technology expertise remain as critical team members. Communication loops remained in place across districts, schools, and classroom teachers in order to maximize consistency in the delivery of appropriate learning strategies and competencies to address students' unfinished learning. Additionally, at VTSS, an infrastructure was built for on-boarding new staff at both the TTACs as well as the VTSS Research and Implementation Center (RIC) to ensure consistency and communication between partners.

As improving literacy is a post-pandemic priority, the VDOE created a cross-disciplinary team (State Implementation Team) to address the implementation of best practices, beginning with extensive resource mapping. This team includes VTSS membership as well as district and school members working collaboratively with the VDOE.

COMPETENCY DRIVER. As mentioned, lessons learned from the pandemic indicated a need for a hybrid training model and the adaptations made in the last reporting period remain in place. The VTSS Training Team examined existing data sources to plan for upcoming trainings based on district needs and hot topics. Trainings were scheduled to provide a variety of times given the lack of substitutes, teacher attrition, retention, and absenteeism.

Coaching practices have also re-shifted from a virtual format to a hybrid format. This shift accommodates both the in-person meetings held by districts while also reducing travel time for state support staff. Post-pandemic restructuring has required both “re-boots” in districts as well as a statewide emphasis on the core features of multi-tiered systems to address the needs of all students. Further, the development of knowledge and skills pertaining to systems of coaching has been an emphasis in VTSS due to capacity data from the District Capacity Assessment indicating an overall weakness across districts. As indicated in a cascading model of support, statewide coaches are writing Coaching Service Delivery Plans (CSDPs) that they will refine internally and then share with districts and schools. These CSDPs reflect the core features of multi-tiers systems of support (MTSS) and internal training sessions were completed to ensure consistency and fidelity across statewide coaches.

ORGANIZATIONAL DRIVER. The VDOE received a Personnel Development Grant (PDG) in 2021, a fully funded proposal for five years (through 2026). The PDG (H325P210003) supports special education teacher recruitment and retention through the application of tiered systems work. This approach leverages core components of MTSS to assist staff in a highly innovative way. The VDOE recognizes the benefits of approaching problems of practice through a systems lens in order to create alignment and sustainability.

The VDOE is working with NIRN/SISEP through a State Management Team to 1) integrate the systems and processes of the VDOE Department of Special Populations, learning and innovation inclusive of the VTSS framework, and the Office of School Quality for a more effective, efficient, and sustainable system of support for our districts and schools; 2) develop a model of cross-agency collaboration to be adopted as the “way of work” of the VDOE; and 3) develop the capacity of school districts to work within a framework (inclusive of selection, implementation, accountability, and sustainability) in order to improve literacy outcomes.

The VDOE has partnered with selected districts to aid in the development of a uniform data platform as an aid to decision support systems. The VTSS has assembled a team of national leaders that are in the process of revising the data-informed decision making process that will be organized in such a way that any district seeking supports at any stage of implementation will be able to use the modules to support where they are.

Policies pertaining to student behavior were clarified and updated as students returned to the classroom and there was need for uniform data collection. These guidelines were reflected in the Student Behavior and Response policy manual.

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.

The most significant milestone achieved in FFY 2022 was the continued alignment of the VTSS to the State’s SiMR and Theory of Action while recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic. Coherent improvement strategies categorized into the three drivers of change (Leadership, Organization, and Competency) are outlined in all phases of the SSIP. Implementing VTSS requires systemic change and infrastructure improvement at the district, school, and classroom levels. Within VTSS, evidence-based, system-wide practices give educators the tools they need to address the academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of all students. Implementation of these practices include frequent progress monitoring that enables educators to make sound, data-based instructional decisions.

Building the VTSS framework is a complex and iterative process that includes the following: stakeholders are identified and consistently included in planning as partners; existing practices and instructional resources are studied, aligned, and organized for efficient delivery; gaps are identified and matched to evidence-based solutions; student progress is frequently and consistently monitored; relevant and actionable data are collected in ways that are readily accessible for decision-making; teams are established to analyze data and make decisions; and, ultimately, all students and adults are integral and valued contributors in a system that is responsive to their needs and seeks to ensure their success. This process requires extensive collaborative dialogue, ongoing and embedded professional learning, effective problem solving, and compromise. The technical assistance and professional development is designed to address the three areas identified in the Theory of Action and meet the short-term and long-term SSIP/SiMR objectives that were set in Phase I and Phase II. These areas include graduation with standard and advanced studies diplomas, academic supports, behavior supports, and effective inclusive practices.

The VDOE uses the DCA to assess the capacity of districts to assist schools in implementing VTSS and measure systems change over time. The capacity of a district to facilitate building-level implementation refers to the systems, activities, and resources that are necessary for schools to successfully adopt and sustain VTSS. A DCA score of 60 percent or above is identified as the acquisition of district capacity. A DCA score of 80 percent or above is identified as fluency in district capacity. Version 7.7 of the DCA was published in October 2019.

Specifically, the purposes of the DCA are to (i) provide a District Implementation Team (DIT) with a structured process for the development of a District Capacity Action Plan; (ii) provide a DIT with information to monitor progress towards district, regional, and state capacity-building goals; (iii) support a common infrastructure for the implementation of VTSS to achieve desired outcomes for students; (iv) serve as a venue to orient new DIT members to strengths and needs of the district; and (v) provide district, regional, and state leadership with a consistent measure of capacity for implementation and sustainment for VTSS in districts. A copy of the DCA and supplemental documents can be viewed on the VTSS-RIC website (<https://vtss-ric.vcu.edu/>). Citation: Ward, C., St. Martin, K., Horner, R., Duda, M., Ingram-West, K., Tedesco, M., Putnam, D., Buenrostro, M., & Chaparro, E. (2015). District Capacity Assessment. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

For the 2022-2023 academic year, the average DCA score for VTSS Cohort 1-2 districts was 59 percent, which is a decrease from the previous academic years. This decrease occurred as districts were recovering from the pandemic and experienced high levels of leadership turnover. Four VTSS 1-2 Cohort districts have DCA scores above 60 percent indicating the acquisition of the capacity to support building-level implementation. Of these four districts, one district has DCA scores above 80 percent indicating fluency in district capacity. These DCA scores support the district’s capacity to sustain and scale-up systems improvement strategies categorized into the three drivers of change: Leadership, Organization, and Competency. The average Leadership Driver score was 76 percent (fluency). The Competency Driver is assessed by four subscales: Fidelity, Selection, Training, and Coaching, with averages of 78 percent (acquisition), 58 percent, 47 percent, and 38 percent, respectively. The Organizational Driver is assessed by three subscales: Decision Support Data Systems, Facilitative Administration, and Systems Intervention, with averages of 67 percent (acquisition), 43 percent, and 44 percent, respectively.

The VDOE uses the TFI to assess school-level implementation of VTSS. The TFI is divided into three sections (Tier 1: Universal Features; Tier 2: Targeted Features; and Tier 3: Intensive Features) that can be used separately or in combination to assess the extent that core features of VTSS are in

place. For the 2022-2023 academic year, the average Tier 1 and Tier 2 TFI scores for VTSS Cohort 1-2 schools were 80 percent and 73 percent, respectively, indicating that, on average, schools are implementing Tiers 1 and 2 with fidelity. This is an important achievement for Tier 2 indicating that continued district support and professional development has impacted school advanced tiers implementation. While the average Tier 3 TFI score has improved, continued district support and professional development is needed to enable schools to reach fidelity at Tier 3.

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.

Virginia will continue infrastructure improvement through the use of implementation science as outlined by the NIRN. The Theory of Action will guide improvement through our Cascading Model, beginning with the macrocosm of the State to the microcosm of the classroom. Improvement will continue to be guided by the Leadership, Organization, and Competency Drivers that foster change processes across the cascaded model.

Current state teams include a Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports State Leadership Team (VTSS-SLT) that provides leadership, guidance, visibility, training, coaching, evaluation, and political support in the Commonwealth. The VTSS Implementation Team is the core group of Systems Coaches across the Commonwealth who provide technical assistance and coaching to districts and schools at the local and regional levels. The VTSS Project Management Team (VTSS-PMT) monitors, reviews, and provides oversight of specific project objectives, coordinate training and coaching activities, and report/propose implementation processes to the VTSS-SLT. The VTSS workgroups and teams have continued to leverage coaches' expertise as well as skill development to better support VTSS allowing for clear lines of communication and alignment within the project. Charges of each group include ensuring we have current research across domains as well as revising and aligning professional development within, across, and to our constituents. Additional next steps are to continue work with State Implementation and Scaling-Up of Evidence-Based Practices (SISEP) to remove silos within the agency. This work is led by the SISEP State Management Team (SISEP-SMT). The team consists of leaders in the VDOE's Department of Special Populations, Office of School Quality, and Office of Humanities, and in the coach/facilitators from SISEP. These changes to state leadership structures will continue to streamline processes and communication for efficient and effective decision-making.

Additionally, systems interventions continue to expand with increased interagency partnerships, including Formed Families Forward; Collaborate for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning; and Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform. These partnerships seek to strengthen family and community involvement and to integrate high-leverage practices for students with disabilities.

Professional development (PD) and technical assistance will continue to occur through three primary collaborative avenues: VDOE, VTSS RIC, and regional TTACs. Given the trends in teacher retention and the onboarding of new instructional staff, districts need to both monitor existing data around the efficacy of the practices and continue to build systems around teacher support to maintain these competencies. A pilot of this work is underway and includes support for special education administrators and intentional practices to support teachers. Further, the collaborative planning for high-quality pedagogy takes place at district-level meetings and training in the area of quality core instruction with representation from both general and special education. The next step is to provide a blended Community of Practice for networking among districts in the areas of family engagement and social-emotional learning. The expected outcome is a broader base of learning for both districts and VTSS Systems Coaches during cooperative learning.

In-person networking events for district systems coaches and state systems coaches have occurred, and data has been collected on district perceptions of these events. Next steps are to develop a hybrid model for offering professional learning beginning with observation of hybrid events carried out by other training teams and the purchase and set-up of OWL video monitors. The VTSS Training Team continues to use a data-informed, decision-making process to determine the calendar of and modes for training offerings in alignment with the curriculum team that ensures quality content.

The VTSS is currently working on a revised scope and sequence that will emphasize an aligned MTSS model across behavior, academics, and social-emotional wellbeing. The new scope and sequence supports training efforts across the cascade including training for state coaches, district leadership, school administrators, and staff within the school building.

The state leadership teaming structures will include a process for selecting team members with diverse representations of role, expertise, and location. Additionally, a process for onboarding new VTSS Systems Coaches has been developed and followed. Both mentors and mentees followed a procedure for deepening knowledge and setting individual coaching goals and PD plans through self-reflection, resulting in positive impact for new employees as well as consistency in the development of knowledge and skills.

A milestone for VTSS has been the pilot of a revised exploration process for new districts. This pilot emphasizes systemic structures, core components of MTSS, and stages of implementation while moving at the pace of each district. Next steps include moving into installation of multi-tiered systems including establishing district procedures and routines to support school implementation. The anticipated outcome is to develop a greater capacity for long-term sustainability as districts begin to implement. Further, this readiness will lead to improved fidelity and capacity during the stages of implementation, offering a more strategic way in which to ensure the quality of coaching services.

Additionally, the process for state-to-district coaching service delivery plans has been refined, strengthening the means for collaboration, problem solving, and reflection that informs training improvements and organizational supports. Next steps include the co-creation and monitoring of plans with districts, inclusive of their role in district-to-school coaching. The intended outcome for these revisions and subsequent co-creation is to build sustainability for coaching within districts. Parallel coaching/training has been and continues to be professional learning in the area of growing coaching systems. This past year, Virginia revised their MTSS core components. To support coaching and training, next steps are to develop a coaching curriculum to support both the SEA and LEA coaching structures. The project will pilot a process for SEA and LEA coaches to reflect, monitor progress, and receive performance feedback. The development of these systems assists and supports the broad scale-up and sustainability within each local division.

The VTSS will continue to use fidelity data and look for ways to improve upon how fidelity data are analyzed for informing both strengths and opportunities for improvement at not only the district and school levels but coaching practices as well. Next steps are the piloting of a slightly revised District Systems Fidelity Inventory with the intended outcome of a more comprehensive fidelity tool for MTSS that leads to action steps to operationalize systems work.

Additional, next steps include collaboration with NIRN to utilize implementation science research with districts participating in activities to increase access to school-based mental health services. Districts will participate in a series of five two-day sessions to build systems infrastructures prior to full implementation of practices for students. The anticipated outcome is the utilization of the drivers to build a sustainable process for increased mental health services as well as apply implementation research to other intended activities and outcomes.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The VDOE supports the alignment and integration of evidence-based practices (EBPs) within the improvement strategies and principal activities as well as assisting districts and schools to do the same. Improvement in graduation rates continues to require attention to the intersection of attendance, behavior, academics, and social-emotional wellness as well as tiered supports. The following EBPs in practice during the reporting period include:

Behavior (developed within the framework of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)):

- Development of a behavior curriculum (schoolwide and classroom-wide expectations and behaviors)
- Explicit instruction of behaviors
- Classroom routines and procedures
- Systems of positive reinforcement
- Corrective feedback
- Check In-Check Out
- Diffusing disruptive behavior
- Functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention plans

Integrated Tier 1 and Advanced Tiers:

- Explicit instruction routines
- Increasing engagement through opportunities to respond
- Formative assessment
- Scaffolding
- Behavior-specific praise
- Feedback
- Strategic Instruction Model
- Fusion Reading
- Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) math instruction
- Orton-Gillingham (OG) trainings
- Hands-on activities for Algebra I
- Science of Reading

Mental Wellness:

- Trauma-sensitive practices

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The VTSS provides explicit training and coaching through New Team Training (behavior) for school teams to implement a behavioral curriculum with selected EBPs that align with the VDOE Student Code of Conduct. The TFI is used as a roadmap for successful development of teams and systems for the use of EBPs within the framework. Both schoolwide and classwide positive expectations are defined according to the values of the school and explicitly taught through lesson plans crafted by the behavioral team and their coach. Within this structure, methods to support positive behavior through the use of routines, procedures, and corrective feedback are encouraged. Behaviors are defined and clarified so that there is an equitable process for managing behavior. Once a strong Tier 1 foundation is established (roughly determined by a score of 70 percent on Tier 1 of the TFI in addition to other indicators), the practice of Check In-Check Out is offered to students who have not responded to the Tier 1 supports. Through the use of customized intervention forms, students monitor their identified progress and receive feedback throughout the day from their teachers. For students experiencing more problematic behaviors, functional behavior assessments with ensuing plans are offered.

Integrated Tier 1 and Advanced Tiers:

- Explicit instruction routines
- Increasing engagement through opportunities to respond
- Formative assessment
- Scaffolding
- Behavior-specific praise
- Feedback
- Strategic Instruction Model
- Fusion Reading
- Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) math instruction
- Orton-Gillingham (OG) trainings
- Hands-on activities for Algebra I

- Science of Reading

The practices of explicit instruction, engagement, opportunities to respond, formative assessment, behavior-specific praise, and feedback have been widely recognized as high-impact and high-leverage practices for all students, including students with disabilities and students impacted by trauma. Strategic Instruction Model, Fusion Reading, and Orton-Gillingham (OG) trainings embed the previously mentioned practices within a language-based, programmatic format. Similarly, Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) math instruction and hands-on activities for Algebra I apply these practices within math.

The VTSS project recognizes the need for strong Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions that are systematically connected to core instruction and implemented with fidelity in both academics and behavior to close the achievement gap for struggling students (Fuchs, Fuchs & Compton, 2012). The EBPs listed above have adaptations that are within advanced tiers for increasing the level or intensity of the practice. For example, a well-designed Tier 2 intervention would include an increased number of opportunities to respond. The Science of Reading refers to the pedagogy and practices proven by extensive research to effectively teach children how to read. The VDOE recommended policy changes to enact changes in the core curricula to improve literacy outcomes through professional learning at the district level.

Trauma-sensitive practices are emphasized within the Trauma module series developed by VTSS. Within the learning modules, teams interact with content that is focused on strategies and classroom practices (academic, social-emotional learning, trauma-sensitive environments, regulation, cognitive problem solving, relationships, schoolwide discipline, self-care) to help guide implementation.

Citation: Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., & Compton, D. L. (2012). Smart RTI: A next-generation approach to multilevel prevention. *Exceptional Children*, 73, 263-279.

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.

The Cascading Model outlines the structure by which outcomes are improved for children and families. Collaboration with national centers such as the NIRN; PBIS; and Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) make visible the research and guidance utilized by states, districts, and schools and provide "roadmaps" for support. The VDOE then applies this knowledge not only by gaining political support but also through the use of a state leadership team that is responsible for both horizontal alignment across the agency as well as vertical support to regions, districts, and schools. Both state and regional support are provided through the VTSS-RIC and VDOE TTACs that are funded for more granular support through training and coaching. These statewide coaches work directly with districts and schools to build competencies to implement and monitor the "way of work" as outlined by both the national centers and the VDOE; subsequently, support is provided to students and families by the districts.

The selected evidence-based practices that are coached need to be a usable innovation in order to impact the SiMR. As defined by NIRN, criteria for a usable innovation include clear description, essential functions, operational definitions of the functions, and a practical way to assess the performance of the practitioner. A process utilized by VTSS was the use of the Hexagon Tool (as provided by NIRN) and/or the Evidence Based Practice Selection Tool (as provided by VTSS) emphasizing the use of a selection tool, either during adoption or to review existing practices. Statewide coaches encouraged teams to make intentional choices as they received additional funding to address the impact of the pandemic as well as any subsequent modifications to continue to address learning loss by students. Other procedures at both the district and school levels are the reinforcement of the use of a variety of resource maps, assessment maps, and/or defining of tiers and initiatives. This type of mapping provides clarity around the innovation as well as the data and systems for support. When practices are introduced in VTSS training, the practices are accompanied by an understanding of the research and value of the practice as well as the "looks like, sounds like" method for delivery (operational definition).

The TFI and VTSS Academic-Tiered Fidelity Inventory TFI (A-TFI) measure the core features (teaming, implementation, and evaluation) of implementing tiered systems of supports for behavior and academics at the school level. Fidelity assessments are essential for analyzing and interpreting outcomes. Without fidelity, we cannot be sure that each practice or innovation was used as intended, that outcomes can be attributed to the use of the practice/innovation, or know where to improve. Fidelity assessments also are a reflection of how well the drivers of Competency, Organization, and Leadership are working to support districts and teachers in the usable innovations. Next steps include increased capacity of districts to accurately reflect on behavioral practices when utilizing the TFI and to integrate components of the A-TFI in plan development without necessarily completing the full assessment. This is a data-driven decision based on feedback pertaining to assessments and comparison of fidelity and outcome data in districts that have been in full implementation. Impact on the SiMR goal is not only improved climate and culture to foster well-being but also increased academic and behavioral skills resulting in competencies for graduation.

At Tier 1, Feature 1.4, both inventories address teaching expectations, strategic selection of practices, and lesson design. Both behavioral and academic competencies are specifically planned, taught, and measured. Lesson design ensures criteria for success and task analysis of skills that impacts outcomes not only for general education students but also students with disabilities. Feature 1.8 emphasizes the quality core instruction of practices such as routines and procedures, feedback, explicit instruction, and scaffolding. Walkthrough data is stated as evidence of fidelity. Item 1.9 describes the positive feedback and acknowledgement delivered by staff as well as student involvement in their own learning goals and metacognitive reflection on learning.

The TFI and A-TFI are similarly used to measure the fidelity of Advanced Tiers. The level of use at Advanced Tiers indicates the degree to which resources are allocated across the continuum. This resource allocation and the need for increased support for some students impacts the SiMR goal by ensuring that all students, including those with disabilities, have the necessary supports to achieve the competencies for graduation mentioned above.

The partnership with Formed Families Forward (FFF) and VTSS resulted in the development of additional videos and enhanced trainings to support families in their understanding of MTSS and EBPs. This school-family connection leads to further engagement and student success. Further, work in Early Childhood pilots brings these practices to the Pre-K population as a means to integrate and improve vertical alignment.

The use of evidence-based practices that are supported by effective responses have been described as "protective factors" for students. Examples of protective factors are early intervention, academic competencies, interpersonal skills, and self-management skills, which are all integrated into the above-mentioned practices. Examples of effective responses that transpire across the cascade mentioned earlier are tiered systems of support,

coaching and professional development, prevention-based behavioral sciences, and high-fidelity implementation. Hence, the SiMR is impacted not only by effective practices but the procedures in place that foster an effective response to those at-risk for graduation.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Congruent with the SSIP, VTSS builds the capacity of the VDOE to implement systems change at the SEA, district, and school levels. The VTSS project promotes a positive and restorative approach to student behavior, school climate, and increased academic performance. The VTSS provides an aligned, contextualized support for the SSIP and sustainable improvements in outcomes for students with disabilities in Virginia by increasing the capacity of districts to employ effective and efficient strategies for academic achievement, reducing the number of discipline infractions, and addressing chronic absenteeism in order to improve graduation rates for students with disabilities, as measured by the SiMR.

To assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan, data are collected, analyzed, and reported back to participants (state, district, and school leadership teams) in order to monitor, refine, and improve the processes and outcomes necessary to address emerging needs or challenges associated with project implementation. Districts and schools participating in VTSS submit data on fidelity of implementation (e.g., District Capacity Assessment for capacity of districts to support VTSS, Tiered Fidelity Inventory for school fidelity) annually during Midyear data collection period.

The DCA measures the capacity of a district to facilitate building-level implementation including the systems, activities, and resources that are necessary for schools to successfully adopt and to sustain VTSS. The specific purposes of the DCA are to (i) provide a DIT with a structured process for the development of a District Capacity Action Plan; (ii) provide a DIT with information to monitor progress towards district, regional, and state capacity-building goals; (iii) support a common infrastructure for the implementation of Effective Innovations to achieve desired outcomes for students; (iv) serve as a venue to orient new DIT members to strengths and needs of the district; and (v) provide district, regional, and state leadership with a consistent measure of capacity for implementation and sustainment for Effective Innovations in districts. A DCA score of 60 percent or above is identified as the acquisition of district capacity, and a score of 80 percent or above is identified as fluency in district capacity.

The TFI provides valid, reliable, and efficient measures to the extent to which school personnel are applying the core features of Universal School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) Features across the three tiers. The TFI is divided into three sections (Tier 1: Universal SWPBIS Features, Tier 2: Targeted SWPBIS Features, and Tier 3: Intensive SWPBIS Features) that can be used separately or in combination to assess the extent that core features of SWPBIS are in place. The purpose of the TFI is to provide one efficient, yet valid and reliable, instrument that can be used over time to guide both implementation and sustained use of SWPBIS. The TFI may be used (a) for an initial assessment to determine if a school is using (or needs) SWPBIS; (b) as a guide for implementation for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 practices; (c) as an index of sustained SW-PBIS implementation; or (d) as a metric for identifying schools for recognition within their state implementation efforts. A TFI score of 70 percent or above is identified as implementing SWPBIS at each tier and, overall, with fidelity.

Additionally, stakeholder input at the district and school levels regarding the effectiveness of VTSS are collected annually. District instruments include Family Engagement, Level of Satisfaction, and Value of Resources surveys that are collected annually during End-of-Year. Annually, VTSS administers the VTSS Perceptions of Impact survey to measure the perceptions of school administrators and staff on VTSS implementation and its impact on student outcomes. Professional development evaluations assess the events for components of high-quality professional learning, session content, and opportunities for attendees to apply learning in their districts and schools. Event Log data are continuously collected to monitor ongoing professional learning and coaching supports provided to VTSS districts and schools. Data collected in the Event Log include the number of training and technical assistance events along with specific event targets including phase of implementation, essential components, and targeted behavior and academic outcomes. This allows VTSS to assess implementation fidelity and practice change.

Performance data on student academic and behavioral outcomes, including attendance and graduation rates, are collected to assess the impact of implementation fidelity and practice change on student outcomes. During the End-of-Year data collection period, VTSS collects school discipline data (office discipline referrals, in-school suspensions, and out-of-school suspensions), which are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and student disability type. Student outcome data are submitted to the State (e.g., student assessments, graduation numbers, attendance) at the end of each academic year. Data from these measures are collected annually when made available by the State.

Using a “discrepancy evaluation model” to assess the gap between “ideal” and “real” as the foundation for the evaluation procedures, both formative and summative data are collected and analyzed. The data, once collected, are analyzed at the state, district, and school-levels and are shared with state, district, and school leadership teams as well as VTSS coaches to assure that districts and schools receive efficient and effective supports. Student academic and behavioral outcomes are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and student disability type to assess outcomes for high-need students. Data collected correlating fidelity with behavior and academic outcomes provide insight into the relationship between intervention fidelity and outcomes. Longitudinal data are used to document trends in the improvement of student outcomes and provide evidence as to the impact of the VTSS elements. Descriptive statistics are used in the analysis of survey data, including session evaluation data as well as surveys that seek to inform how elements of VTSS are being received and implemented in schools and districts. Qualitative data from professional development evaluations and event logs are examined to provide guidance in the refinement of the VTSS framework and implementation plan.

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.

In the VTSS, districts and schools use a data-informed, decision-making process to select each EBP and determine its ongoing use. Specific data collected by each district and school varies based on the EBPs selected. School leadership teams, along with district team members who support them, build an integrated and aligned data system that allows “real time” access to data necessary for effective and efficient decision-making. Teams build routines to use data from existing systems as necessary for decision-making, including analyzing EBP implementation fidelity, root causes, and outcome data to evaluate implementation progress. When possible, district and school teams identify opportunities for enhancing the schoolwide system for aggregating data to inform instructional decisions.

Examples of behavior data that may be used by schools include office discipline referrals, suspensions, expulsions, attendance, nursing/counselor visits, minor incident reports, at-risk factors, and/or fidelity data. Examples of academic data that may be used by schools include universal screening data, benchmark data, common formative assessments (classroom performance), progress monitoring data, historical state assessment results (Virginia Standards of Learning), early warning systems, graduation data, and/or fidelity data. Examples of data to assess disproportionality that may be used by schools include disaggregated (by gender, race/ethnicity, socio-economic status, disability, and disability type) behavior and academic data; dropout rates; graduation rates and types of diplomas (standard versus advanced); enrollment in honors and advanced placement classes; and community data

on poverty, unemployment, incarceration, etc. Examples of school climate data that may be used by schools include student, parent, and staff climate surveys or focus groups, harassment/bullying, hot spots (environment), physical aggression/fighting, and attendance (staff and student). Additional data that may be used by schools include school climate; school safety; nurse/counselor visits; student engagement; information gathered from families; and community data (statistics on prevalence of mental illnesses and trends in the use of mental health services). Examples of attendance data that may be used by schools include average daily attendance, truancy, tardies, chronic absenteeism (excused or unexcused), suspensions, expulsions, dropout rates, and absences due to health. Examples of family engagement data that may be used by schools include participation in events/programs, participation in creation of learning and behavior expectations, attendance at leadership meetings representative of the school community, parent-teacher conference attendance, data on frequency and attempts to reach out to families, and delivery of supplies and supports to meet basic family needs. Examples of community engagement data that may be used by schools include two-way communication with community partners; support (e.g., funds, products, time, mentorships); and collaboration with Tier 2 and Tier 3 service providers.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

In addition to the current ongoing activities previously described, next steps will focus on expanding the three previously identified main areas, as follows: 1) deepening coaching practice, training, and knowledge specifically in implementation stages; 2) supporting districts to utilize the Implementation Drivers to support usable innovations; and 3) expanding the use of Advanced Tiers and High-Leverage Practices through PD around evidence-based practices and Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS).

Change is impossible to circumvent in the field of education; it is an inevitable component that requires complex skills and abilities to implement at a large scale. While the VTSS has used implementation stages since its inception, patterns are emerging, both qualitatively and quantitatively, that indicate there are clear gaps and/or inconsistencies in rates of improvement, implementation, and/or sustainable aspects required for systems change. A hybrid structure that moves coaching to a primary mode for conducting stages of implementation activities and training as a secondary function to support knowledge development and communities of networking and practice was developed. During the next reporting period, eight districts will pilot the revision of the Installation process followed by Initial Implementation. This marks a difference in previously presented coaching and training during which Exploration and Installation were presented together in an all-cohorts format. The VTSS director and SEA lead will begin this process through individualized overviews and on-site visitation along with the assigned statewide systems coaches. The intended goal is that districts will be able to successfully build a solid data-informed process to support ongoing professional learning and implementation of selected practices.

It is critical to continue to ensure that the transfer of this information generalizes at the local level. Improvement in the ability to utilize Implementation Drivers to support, implement, and evaluate usable innovations that will be replicable and sustainable over time is the next step in delivering support to the district coaches, coordinators, and leadership teams. The Coaching Team and Coaching Workgroup have revisited key topics in research pertaining to coaching. Next steps will be to revise the coaching curriculum with emphasis on both coaching skills and MTSS content knowledge. The NIRN describes four key criteria for usable innovation implementation as follows: 1) a clear description of the innovation; 2) description of the features needed to define the innovation; 3) operational definitions of the critical aspects; and 4) assessment. Implementation Drivers (i.e., Fidelity, Coaching, Training, Selection) steer the use and improvement of usable innovations, thereby ensuring that the Evidence-Based Practices described are sustained within a multi-tiered system and ensure positive student outcomes.

Knowledge development of Advanced Tiers will occur at the systems coach level both in general content and coaching applications. As a cadre of VTSS trainers have been on-boarded, there is increased capacity to provide individualized support to both state and district coaches alike with the goal of increasing local capacity. The professional learning begins with an overview of all components with subsequent deeper learning into each area. Key components of Advanced Tiers have been organized in the following areas: teaming, screening and request for assistance, decision rules, continuum of support, alignment, progress monitoring, data-informed decision-making, and professional learning and coaching. Specific emphasis will be placed on using implementation stages through activities that build an infrastructure at the district and school levels to support Advanced Tier Systems, data, and practices that impact student outcomes for any instructional intervention.

Another next step is the continued integration of high-leverage practices (HLP) for inclusive classrooms into PD and coaching in the areas of equity, instruction, social-emotional wellness, etc. For example, a consistent, organized, and respectful learning environment falls within the the category of social/emotional/behavioral HLPs and is taught and coached in professional learning in New Team Training for behavior, Effective Classroom Practices, and the newly developed trauma modules. Another example relates to the instructional HLP of "teaching cognitive and metacognitive strategies to support learning and independence"; this instructional practice is reflected in Feature 1.9 of the Academic-Tiered Fidelity Inventory (A-TFI; 1.9c Metacognitive Reflection on Learning) and resources provided in the A-TFI professional learning. As explicit connections are drawn to both HLPs for inclusive classrooms and the data, systems, and EBPs for all students, the criteria for usable innovations are met. In order to further develop systems competencies to support students, brief modules on the intent of the A-TFI features and how to score those features will be developed.

At the state level, coordination of services within the VDOE's Department of Student Services to meet the needs of districts identified for CCEIS will be aligned with implementation science as well as best practices at Advanced Tiers. Brief videos were developed for use with districts.

Collectively, the outcomes for these next steps align with the Theory of Action to improve and increase use of EBPs and HLPs in order to improve student outcomes.

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 SiMR data that supports Virginia's SSIP has been an tremendous success. There has been sustained marked improvement from the baseline year (Phase I) that resulted in a 27.26 percent increase in the statewide rate of graduation for students identified with a primary disability of ED, ID, OHI, or SLD who received a regular high school diploma from 54.9 percent in FFY 2013 (baseline) to 82.16 percent in FFY 2022.

Based on stakeholders' discussion, there is overwhelming agreement that Virginia should continue to implement the SSIP without modification and continue to coordinate and align efforts under a singular framework of multi-tiered systems of support that is grounded in implementation science and focused on capacity building using data-driven decision-making.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

During the development of Virginia's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Part B SPP/APR, multiple opportunities for stakeholder involvement were provided, including the following: presentations, meetings, focus groups, and conference calls. The focus of stakeholder involvement was to review and consider revising the FFY 2022–2025 targets, analyzing previous and current data, revising/developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Stakeholders included members from the State Special Education Advisory Committee (SSEAC), parents, school district central office personnel, other state agencies, PEATC staff members, TTACs staff members, early childhood specialists, transition specialists, elementary and secondary principals, representatives of higher education, assessment specialists, VDOE staff members, and other community members as needed.

Staff members from the VDOE organized and led numerous stakeholder groups. The VDOE staff members served as indicator chairs by topical area with a focus on the data, targets, and recommendations related to their specific indicator. Additional staff members represented the broad spectrum of work done within the VDOE Department of Special Populations. Additionally, indicator chairs met regularly to gauge progress, share strategies, and suggestions. In some cases, surveys were administered to ensure all stakeholders have equal opportunities to be heard and have led to additional initiatives and resources.

In FFY 2022, stakeholders were informed, including members of the SSEAC, of the activities planned to deepen the alignment of the SSIP work across numerous VDOE offices. Specifically, stakeholders annually review and/or revise the activities described in previous submissions to ensure that they continue to be aligned with the Theory of Action.

Virginia continues to engage in work, with the support of OSEP-funded technical assistance providers, to increase stakeholder involvement across all phases of the SSIP. Virginia continues to work with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT:C) as we bring in additional partners (Virginia Department of Aging and Rehabilitative Services, Virginia Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services, Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice, TTACs, and CTI) in as we work to improve postsecondary outcomes for youth with disabilities. In addition, we are working with VDOE's Postsecondary Support Specialist, School Counseling Specialist, and the State Counsel for Higher Education's Workgroup on Improving Access under the Director of Strategic Planning and Policy Studies. We are also working with WestEd's Grad PSO Capacity Building Network.

Moving forward, Virginia will continue to work with the Results-Based Accountability and Supports (RBAS) Team hosted by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). Over the course of the next year, the group plans to offer face-to-face and web-based CSLCs. The CSLCs provide an opportunity for state teams to come together to learn about evidence-based practices, stakeholder engagement, systems change, and evaluation. Teams are provided with opportunities to work together on their SSIP, learn from experts, and share experiences through cross-state conversations.

The VDOE has also implemented strategies and tools provided by the IDEA Partnership, in collaboration with the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) as part of their work around Leading by Convening: A Blueprint for Authentic Engagement.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Stakeholders have input into how VTSS is implemented. Each VTSS activity is evaluated for components of high-quality professional learning, session content, and opportunities to apply learning in their districts and schools. Data are collected, analyzed, and reported back to participants (state, district, and school leadership teams) in order to monitor, refine, and improve the processes and outcomes necessary to address emerging needs or challenges associated with project implementation. Additionally, stakeholder input at the district and school levels regarding the effectiveness of VTSS are evaluated using multiple surveys (Family Engagement Survey, Level of Satisfaction, and Value of Resources by districts), focus groups, VTSS Perceptions of Impact Survey completed by school staff, and professional development evaluations. Event Log data are used to monitor ongoing coaching support provided to VTSS districts and schools.

Our family partner to the VTSS project, Formed Families Forward (FFF), works to engage local districts and schools as partners and collaborators. Recognizing the importance of building family engagement within a collaborative environment, FFF embraces an interactive approach that positions families, VTSS systems coaches, and district staff to work as partners, learning from each other as they consider the needs and experiences of families and communities. This collaboration is reflected in a series of training videos titled, "Family Engagement in Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports," produced by FFF. This series of videos features six key elements to engage families in VTSS. Designed for use by educators and families, the four videos highlight specific strategies for school teams to consider as they build momentum around family-school partnerships and strengthen skills to meaningfully engage families in multi-tiered systems.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

No

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.

The 2021 General Assembly appropriated funding to attract, recruit, and retain high-quality, diverse individuals to teach science, technology, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) subjects in Virginia middle and high schools experiencing difficulty in recruiting qualified teachers.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Evaluation activities include event data (i.e., event description, attendees, and post-event evaluations), implementation measures, and student outcomes (i.e., academic, discipline, attendance, and graduation). Professional learning attendance collected for each day of an event and post-event evaluations completed by attendees will be collected following each training event. Event Log data are collected from VTSS Systems Coaches following each event/meeting with their districts and schools. The VTSS collects district and school data twice a year during Midyear and End-of-Year. Midyear data collection period begins February 1, 2024, and will end March 29, 2024. Measures collected during Midyear are the DCA for districts and TFI for schools. End-of-Year data collection period occurs from May 1, 2024, to July 12, 2024. Measures collected during End-of-Year are the Family Engagement Survey, Level of Satisfaction (LOS), and Value of Resources (VOR) for districts and student enrollment and discipline (office discipline referrals, in-school suspensions, and out-of-school suspensions) for schools. During the 2023-2024 academic year, VTSS is piloting the District Systems Fidelity Inventory (DSFI) with a sample of districts. This process will provide information on the administration and scoring of the instrument as well as the use of the data to inform district implementation and planning. Additionally, student behavioral, academic, and school climate data will be collected at the end of each academic year by the VDOE. Student behavioral and academic outcomes will be disaggregated by race/ethnicity and student disability type to assess outcomes for high-need students.

The data timeline and measures collected are to inform implementation and progress towards project targets set forth in the Theory of Action for the SSIP/SiMR. Anticipated outcomes from professional development and coaching events include improved district capacity to assist school-level implementation (measured by DCA), improved school-level implementation (measured by TFI), and improved knowledge and skills of evidence-based practices (measured by Perceptions of Impact). Following the Theory of Action, with the improved fidelity of implementation by district and school leadership teams and staff, the student academic, behavior, and attendance outcomes, including reduced disproportionality for students with disabilities, should improve. Specifically, the expected academic, behavior, and attendance outcomes targeted in the SSIP include improved percentage of students with disabilities graduating with advanced or standard diplomas, improved percentage of students with disabilities that pass the eighth-grade English reading and math Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments, decreased number of disciplinary actions (office discipline referrals, in-school suspensions, and out-of-school suspensions) for students with disabilities, and reduced number of students with disabilities who miss more than ten days of instruction in a school year.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Whereas students have returned to in-person learning, barriers related to and exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic persist. Districts and schools continue to experience personnel burnout and turnover, high rates of absenteeism and report that students remain absent for longer periods of time, and learning loss that has resulted in declined performance on state assessments. The VDOE has taken steps to address persistent learning loss by providing additional funding for tutoring and remediation with guidelines and software platforms for localities for all students.

Teacher burnout and turnover remains high with limited numbers of substitutes available and credentialed teachers to fill the need. Virginia is addressing this barrier through collaboration between offices within the VDOE, VTSS, and districts/schools to allocate resources and provide supports as necessary. Additionally, the VDOE received a Personnel Development Grant (PDG) in 2021, a fully funded proposal for five years (through 2026). The PDG (H325P210003) supports special education teacher recruitment and retention through the application of tiered systems work, inclusive of descriptions of supports to teachers, administrator training, and professional learning in implementation science in partnership with NIRN. This approach leverages core components of MTSS to assist staff in a highly innovative way. The VDOE recognizes the benefits of approaching problems of practice through a systems lens in order to create alignment and sustainability. Lessons learned from the piloting of this work can help with teacher retention in Virginia. The VTSS continues to offer tailored-to-need professional learning for individual districts by their Systems Coaches at convenient times in order to allow district and school staff to attend.

In the Pandemic Impact on Public K-12 Education 2022 Report, student behavior was rated as the most serious issue faced by school staff (Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC), 2022). Compared to pre-pandemic student behavior, school staff believe both behavioral issues (85 percent) and severity of behavioral issues (84 percent) have increased. Due to the significant link between student behavior and mental health, it is of note that data indicate that 34 percent of middle school students reported needing support with mental health and 40 percent of high school students reported feeling sad or hopeless for two weeks or more. Additionally, self-harm emergency department visits for children aged 9 to 18 doubled since 2021. Kindergarten teachers reported being moderately, very, or extremely concerned about the mental health of 14 percent of students (Virginia Kindergarten Readiness Program, 2023) and Pre-K teachers reported significant concerns about 23 percent of three-year olds and 19 percent of four-year olds in Fall 2022. In response to this crisis, Virginia has applied for and received School Based Mental Health Professional Grants (S184H200009; S184H220101). The State and VTSS continue to leverage components of MTSS and provide ongoing professional learning and coaching to assist participating districts to use a systemic approach to address the recruitment and retainment of school-based mental health professionals and to address the mental health needs of students and staff.

Virginia faces barriers of declined performance on state assessments and increased chronic absenteeism as the rest of the nation. To support districts and schools, the VTSS staff have been creating and delivering asynchronous and synchronous professional development to address this current reality. Seven strategies for schools to utilize are as follows: relationship building, lesson planning to focus on essential skills, formative assessment to identify skill deficits and provide flexible instruction, classwide intervention in numeracy and literacy, increased engagement (inclusive of peer learning, opportunities to respond, and student goal-setting), more frequent progress monitoring at Tier 1, and promoting teacher agency (collective teacher efficacy). Further, practices to engage families continues to be offered as requested as a strategy to reduce absenteeism.

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:

Samantha Marsh Hollins

Title:

Assistant Superintendent

Email:

Samantha.Hollins@doe.virginia.gov

Phone:

804-750-8738

Submitted on:

04/23/24 3:51:17 PM

Determination Enclosures

Data Rubric

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

Indicator	Calculation
A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) **Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) **Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	5/3/2023

2) **Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) **Passed Edit Check** – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.