

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 EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	17.18%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	10.50%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	5.71%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	15.17%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	5.74%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	4.76%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	17.30%	17.40%	17.50%	17.60%	17.70%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.60%	10.70%	10.80%	10.90%	11.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	5.80%	5.90%	6.00%	6.10%	6.20%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	15.30%	15.40%	15.50%	15.60%	15.70%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.80%	5.90%	6.00%	6.10%	6.20%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	4.90%	5.00%	5.10%	5.20%	5.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Discussions and Stakeholder input of the State's Performance Plan (SPP), Annual Performance Report (APR), State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and Results Driven Accountability (RDA)/Results Based Accountability (RBA) began in 2013 with our State Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel is fully vested and broadly representative of Montana. Additionally, many of the panel members as well as SEA staff serve in other agency or organization leadership positions or on advisory groups in the disability community. This enables MT to draw insight and advice from a broad group of stakeholders with an understanding of Montana's unique needs, strengths, and potential weaknesses.

Other stakeholder groups we sponsor and/or engage include:

--Our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) includes both regional and state councils that regularly meet to assess APR data and to evaluate professional development priorities and results.

--The OPI staff has developed productive working relationships with other Montana agencies that serve youth and adults with disabilities. OPI staff participate as members of advisory councils for early childhood, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, developmental disabilities, the state independent living council and the mental health divisions of the DPHHS. These connections have allowed the OPI staff to build strong working relationships with other agencies, which has resulted in multiple collaborative projects that have strengthened the commitments of all involved to working with Montana's youth to facilitate smooth transitions from birth to adulthood.

--Working with staff from TAESE, the OPI has facilitated the Montana Higher Education Consortium (HEC) for twenty years. The HEC continues to be a part of CSPD and brings together members of faculty from each of the colleges and universities teacher prep programs in Montana. Participation in the consortium is strong and includes faculty members from each of the public and private colleges in Montana. This group has worked to provide greater standardization of the teacher training programs in Montana and has worked together to improve pre-service training programs.

--The OPI staff is also engaged with the Schools Administrators of Montana (SAM) which include affiliates for Superintendents, Principals, Special Education Administrators, and Information Technology (IT) Directors. This partnership allows us to respond quickly to needs expressed in the field by school staff. We also provide SAM with a grant to help fund the Montana Recruitment Project. This program focuses on recruiting hard to fill positions such as speech/language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, and school psychologists for our districts throughout Montana.

Annually, the State Education Agency (SEA) brings together representatives from these stakeholder groups for a joint meeting facilitated by TAESE. This meeting gathers over 80 front-line stakeholders together to share up-dates of issues and gather input from a comprehensive representation of the Montana disability community, families and parents of children and students with and without disabilities. For the past seven years, the topic has been Montana's SSIP and activities have been conducted to solicit both general and specific stakeholder input. During the spring 2022 meeting, the state presented on using data within the state for Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to make decisions. This also included how to interpret the APR data.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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 regular assessment	1,297	1,245	723
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	149	115	57
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	52	45	4

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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 regular assessment	1,290	1,202	778
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	117	41	21
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or	55	24	2

above proficient against grade level			
--------------------------------------	--	--	--

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	201	1,297	18.10%	17.30%	15.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	160	1,245	11.73%	10.60%	12.85%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	61	723	6.15%	5.80%	8.44%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Montana cannot explain slippage directly since the assessments used in FFY2022 were the same shortened versions used in FFY2021. However, one possible explanation of slippage may be due to the grade 4 cohort taking the statewide assessment in the 2021-2022 school year being the cohort of students tested that were most impacted by the COVID 19 pandemic. On March 15, 2020, the Governor temporarily shut down the state, including all school districts. The length of closure of school districts varied due to local control and tribal government. The length of school closures, or remote instruction, a model new to both students and teachers, are one of the key factors in unfinished learning as reflected by the slippage in student achievement. Montana compared the special education data to the data for all students in 4th grade across the state for both the regular assessment, the alternate assessment, and the NAEP in reading, and see similar trends in slippage which leads us to believe that COVID 19 was the leading factor for the special education slippage.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	172	1,290	13.10%	15.30%	13.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	65	1,202	4.49%	5.80%	5.41%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	23	778	2.60%	4.90%	2.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Montana publicly reports Assessment proficiency data on its GEMS website (<https://gems.opi.mt.gov/student-data>). This is the public data store and reporting platform used for all data within the OPI. Instructions to access the data can be found on the IDEA Data page on the OPI website (<https://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files/Special%20Education/IDEA%20Data/Accessing%20Assessment%20Proficiency%20Data%20in%20GEM%20S.pdf?ver=2022-09-30-083434-713>)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2022 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2020, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Upon receipt of the FFY2020 APR Determination Letter, Montana began a review of its public data reporting website to determine why the link provided in the FFY2020 APR did not work for OSEP. It was determined that while the link to the main GEMS site was still good, access to the required data had changed slightly from what was provided during clarification. On August 8, 2022, OPI Special Education Leadership and the IDEA Part B Data Manager met with their OSEP State Lead and Associate Division Director (ADD) to apprise OSEP of their findings and determine the best way to move forward and meet the required action from the determination letter. It was determined in that meeting that creating step by step directions for how to find the required data and posting them to the IDEA Data section of the OPI website would be the most appropriate and expedient way to address the required action. That document was created, reviewed by OPI Leadership, approved, and posted on the OPI website within the required 90 days. The document and link to the website were also sent to the OSEP State Lead and ADD.

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions