



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

June 28, 2016

Honorable Richard Whitley
Director
Nevada Department of Health
and Human Services
4126 Technology Way
Carson City, Nevada 89706

Dear Director Whitley:

I am writing to advise you of the U. S. Department of Education's (Department) 2016 determination under sections 616 and 642 of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. The Department has determined that Nevada meets the requirements and purposes of Part C of the *IDEA*. This determination is based on the totality of the State's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Your State's 2016 determination is based on the data reflected in the State's "2016 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) Results Components and Appendices that include scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Sections 616(d) and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2016: Part C" (HTDMD).

OSEP is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2016, as it did for Part C determinations in 2015. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD and reflected in the RDA Matrix for your State.) For 2016, the Department's *IDEA* Part C determinations continue to include consideration of each State's Child Outcomes data, which measures how children who receive *IDEA* Part C services are improving functioning in three outcome areas that are critical to school readiness:

- Positive social-emotional skills;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

- acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Specifically, the Department considered the data quality and the child performance levels in each State's Child Outcomes FFY 2014 data.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of your State's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the SPP/APR module using your State-specific log-on information at osep.grads360.org. When you access your State's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in Indicators 1 through 10, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that the State is required to take. The actions that the State is required to take are in two places:

- (1) any actions related to the correction of findings of noncompliance are in the "OSEP Response" section of the indicator; and
- (2) any other actions that the State is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include an OSEP response and/or Required Actions.

You will also find all of the following important documents saved as attachments to the Progress Page:

- (1) the State's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD document;
- (3) a spreadsheet entitled "2016 Data Rubric Part C," which shows how OSEP calculated the State's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix;
- (4) a document entitled "Dispute Resolution 2014-15," which includes the *IDEA* section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (5) a Data Display, which presents certain State-reported data in a transparent, user-friendly manner and is helpful for the public in getting a broader picture of State performance in key areas.

As noted above, the State's 2016 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's 2016 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three *IDEA* Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2013, 2014, and 2015), and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2016 determination.

States were required to submit Phase II of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2016. OSEP appreciates the State's ongoing work on its SSIP and its efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. We have carefully reviewed your submission and will provide feedback in the upcoming weeks. Additionally, OSEP will continue to work with your State as it develops Phase III of the SSIP, due April 3, 2017.

As a reminder, your State must report annually to the public, by posting on the State lead agency's web-site, on the performance of each early intervention service (EIS) program located

in the State on the targets in the SPP as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the State's submission of its FFY 2014 SPP/APR. In addition, your State must:

- (1) review EIS program performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each EIS program "meets the requirements" of Part C, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part C of the *IDEA*;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each EIS program of its determination.

Further, your State must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the State lead agency's Web site. Within the next several days, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile for your State that:

- (1) will be accessible to the public;
- (2) includes links to a PDF of the State's SPP/APR, including all of the State's and OSEP's attachments; and
- (3) the State may use to make its SPP/APR accessible to the public.

We will provide you with the link to that profile when it is live.

OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and looks forward to working with your State over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. If you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance, please contact Priscilla Irvine, your OSEP State lead, at 202-245-6913.

Sincerely,



Ruth E. Ryder
Acting Director
Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Part C Coordinator

HOW THE DEPARTMENT MADE DETERMINATIONS

UNDER
SECTIONS 616(D) AND 642 OF
THE *INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT* IN 2016:
PART C



INTRODUCTION

In 2016, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) is continuing to use both results and compliance data in making our determination for each State under sections 616(d) and 642 of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)* for each State's early intervention program under Part C of the *IDEA*. We considered the totality of the information we have about a State, including information related to the State's Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2014 State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR), Indicator C3 Child Outcomes data (Outcomes data) and other data reported in each State's FFY 2014 SPP/APR; information from monitoring and other publicly available information, such as Special Conditions on the State's grant award under Part C; and other issues related to State compliance with the *IDEA*.

In examining each State's Outcomes data, we specifically considered the following results elements:

- (1) Data quality by examining—
 - (a) the completeness of the State's data, and
 - (b) how the State's FFY 2014 data compared to four years of historic data to identify data anomalies; and
- (2) Child performance by examining—
 - (a) how each State's FFY 2014 data compared with all other States' FFY 2014 data, and
 - (b) how each State's FFY 2014 data compared with its own FFY 2013 data.

Below is a detailed description of how the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) evaluated States' data using the Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix. The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on SPP/APR Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) Results Components and Appendices that include scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's Determination.

A. RDA Percentage and Determination

Each State's RDA Percentage was calculated by adding 50% of the State's Results Score and 50% of the State's Compliance Score. The State's RDA Determination is defined as follows:

1. Meets Requirements

A State's 2016 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%,¹ unless the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three *IDEA* Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2013, 2014, and 2015), and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2016 determination.

2. Needs Assistance

A State's 2016 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three *IDEA* Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2013, 2014, and 2015), and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2016 determination.

3. Needs Intervention

A State's 2016 RDA Determination is Needs Intervention if the RDA Percentage is less than 60%.

4. Needs Substantial Intervention

The Department did not make a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention for any State in 2016.

B. Part C RDA Matrix 2016 and Results Score

In making each State's 2016 determination, the Department used the FFY 2014 early childhood outcomes data reported by each State under SPP/APR Indicator C3 by considering the following results elements:

1. Data Quality

(a) Data Completeness:

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in each State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data and the total number of children the State reported exiting during FFY 2014 in its FFY 2014 *IDEA* Section 618 Exiting data; and

(b) Data Anomalies:

Data anomalies were calculated by examining how the State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data compared to four years of historic data.

2. Child Performance

(a) Data Comparison:

How each State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data compared with all other States' FFY 2014 Outcomes data; and

¹ In determining whether a State has met this 80% matrix criterion for a Meets Requirements determination, the Department will round up from 79.5% (but no lower) to 80%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 60% matrix criterion for a Needs Assistance determination discussed below, the Department will round up from 59.5% (but no lower) to 60%.

(b) Performance Change Over Time:

How each State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data compared with its own FFY 2013 Outcomes data.

Calculation of each of these results elements and scoring is further described below:

1. Data Quality

(a) Data Completeness:

The data completeness score was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data and the total number of children your State reported exiting during FFY 2014 in its FFY 2014 *IDEA* Section 618 Exiting data. Each State received a percentage, which was computed by dividing the number of children reported in the State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data by the number of children the State reported exited during FFY 2014 in the State's FFY 2014 *IDEA* Section 618 Exiting Data. This yielded a percentage such that each State received a data completeness score of '2' if the percentage was at least 65%; a data completeness score of '1' if the percentage was between 34% and 64%; and a data completeness score of '0' if the percentage were less than 34%. For the two States with approved sampling plans, the State received a '2'. (Data Sources: FFY 2014 APR Indicator C3 data and ED Facts SY 2014-2015; data extracted 6/7/2016.)

(b) Data Anomalies:

The data anomalies score for each State represents a summary of the data anomalies in each State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2010 – FFY 2013 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C.² For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using this publicly available data. A lower and upper scoring percentage was set at one standard deviation above and below the mean for category a and two standard deviations above or below the mean for categories b through e. In any case where the low scoring percentage set from one or two standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the

² The three Child Outcome areas are: Outcome A (Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); Outcome B (Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)); and Outcome C (Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their need). The five Progress Categories under SPP/APR Indicator C3 are the following:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning
 - b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
 - c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
 - d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
 - e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers
- Outcomes A, B, and C under SPP/APR Indicator C- each contain these five progress categories for a total of 15 progress categories.

data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State's data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a '0' for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomalies score of '0', '1', or '2' is based on the total points awarded. Each State received a data anomalies score of '2' if the total points received in all progress categories were 13 through 15; a data anomalies score of '1' for 10 through 12 points; and a data anomalies score of '0' for zero through nine points. (Data Sources: States' FFY 2009 through FFY 2013 SPP/APR Indicator C3 data and each State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data)

2. Child Performance

(a) Data Comparison:

The data comparison overall performance score represents how your State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2014 Outcomes data. Each State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements (SS) for that State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States.³ The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement. Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned '0', '1', or '2' points.

If a State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned a score of '0'. If a State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned '1' point, and if a State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned '2' points. The points were added across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive total points between 0 and 12, with the total points of '0' indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were below the 10th percentile and a total points of 12 indicating all 6 Summary Statements were above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of '0', '1', or '2' was based on the total points awarded.

The data comparison Overall Performance Score for this results element of '0', '1', or '2' for each State is based on the total points awarded. Each State received an Overall Performance Score of: '2' if the total points across SS1 and SS2 were nine through 12 points; score of '1' for five through eight points; and score of '0' for zero through four points. (Data Sources: All States'

³ Each of the three Child Outcome Areas (A, B, and C) are measured by the following two Summary Statements:

1. Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.
2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

SPP/APR Indicator C3 data from FFY 2009 – FFY 2013 and each State’s FFY 2014 SPP/APR Indicator C3 data.)

(b) Performance Change Over Time:

The Overall Performance Change Score represents how each State’s FFY 2014 Outcomes data compared with its FFY 2013 Outcomes data and whether the State’s data demonstrated progress. The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase. The specific steps for each State are described in the State’s RDA Matrix. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas were totaled, resulting in total points ranging from 0 – 12. The Overall Performance Change Score for this results element of ‘0’, ‘1’, or ‘2’ for each State is based on the total points awarded. Each State received an Overall Performance Change Score of: ‘2’ if the total points were eight or above; a score of ‘1’ for four through seven points; and score of ‘0’ for below three points. (Data Source: SPP/APR Indicator C3 data from FFY 2013 and 2014)

C. 2016 Part C Compliance Matrix and Compliance Score

In making each State’s 2016 determination, the Department used a Compliance Matrix, reflecting the following compliance data:

1. The State’s FFY 2014 data for Part C Compliance Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C (including whether the State reported valid and reliable data for each indicator); and whether the State demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance it had identified in FFY 2012 under such indicators;
2. The timeliness and accuracy of data reported by the State under sections 616, 618, and 642 of the *IDEA*;
3. The State’s FFY 2014 data, reported under section 618 of the *IDEA*, for the timeliness of State complaint and due process hearing decisions;
4. Longstanding Noncompliance:

The Department considered:

- a. Whether the Department imposed Special Conditions on the State’s FFY 2015 *IDEA* Part C grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2016 determination, and the number of years for which the State’s Part C grant award has been subject to Special Conditions; and
- b. Whether there are any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 or earlier by either the Department or the State that the State has not yet corrected.

The Compliance Matrix indicates a score of ‘0’, ‘1’, or ‘2’ for each of the compliance indicators in item one above and for each of the additional factors listed in items two through four above. Using the cumulative possible number of points as the denominator, and using as the numerator the actual points

the State received in its scoring under these factors, the Compliance Matrix reflects a Compliance Score, which is combined with the Results Score to calculate the State's RDA percentage and determination.

1. Scoring of the Matrix for Compliance Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C

In the 2016 Part C Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for each of Compliance Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, and 8C⁴:

- Two points, if either:
 - The State's FFY 2014 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95%⁵ compliance; or
 - The State's FFY 2014 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 90% compliance; and the State identified one or more findings of noncompliance in FFY 2013 for the indicator, and has demonstrated correction of all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for the indicator. Such full correction is indicated in the matrix with a "Y" (for "yes") in the "Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013" column.⁶
- One point, if the State's FFY 2014 data for the indicator were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 75% compliance, and the State did not meet either of the criteria above for two points.
- Zero points, under any of the following circumstances:
 - The State's FFY 2014 data for the indicator reflect less than 75% compliance; or
 - The State's FFY 2014 data for the indicator were not valid and reliable;⁷ or
 - The State did not report FFY 2014 data for the indicator.⁸

⁴ A notation of "N/A" (for "not applicable") in the "Performance" column for an indicator denotes that the indicator is not applicable to that particular State. The points for that indicator are not included in the denominator for the matrix, and the indicator does not impact the State's Compliance Score, RDA percentage, or RDA determination.

⁵ In determining whether a State has met this 95% compliance criterion, the Department will round up from 94.5% (but no lower) to 95%. Similarly, in determining whether a State has met the 90% compliance criterion discussed below, the Department will round up from 89.5% (but no lower) to 90%. In addition, in determining whether a State has met the 75% compliance criterion discussed below, the Department will round up from 74.5% (but no lower) to 75%.

⁶ An "N" (for "no") in that column denotes that the State has one or more remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction. An "N/A" (for "not applicable") in that column denotes that the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2013 for the indicator.

⁷ If a State's FFY 2014 data for any compliance indicator are not valid and reliable, the matrix so indicates in the "Performance" column, with a corresponding score of "0." The explanation of why the State's data are not valid and reliable is contained in the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2014 SPP/APR in GRADS 360.

⁸ If a State reported no FFY 2014 data for any compliance indicator, the matrix so indicates in the "Performance" column, with a corresponding score of '0.'

2. Scoring of the Matrix for Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data

In the 2016 Part C Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data**⁹:

- Two points, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the OSEP-calculated percentage reflects less than 75% compliance.

3. Scoring of the Matrix for Timely State Complaint Decisions and Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions

In the 2016 Part C Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for timely State complaint decisions and for timely due process hearings, as reported by the State under section 618 of the *IDEA*:

- Two points, if the State's FFY 2014 data were valid and reliable, and reflect at least 95% compliance.
- One point, if the State's FFY 2014 data reflect at least 75% and less than 95% compliance.
- Zero points, if the State's FFY 2014 data reflect less than 75% compliance.
- Not Applicable (N/A), if the State's data reflect less than 100% compliance, and there were fewer than ten State complaint decisions or ten due process hearing decisions.

4. Scoring of the Matrix for Long-Standing Noncompliance (Includes Both Uncorrected Identified Noncompliance and Special Conditions)

In the 2016 Part C Compliance Matrix, a State received points as follows for the Long-Standing Noncompliance component:

- Two points, if the State has:
 - No remaining findings of noncompliance identified by OSEP or the State; in FFY 2012 or earlier, and

⁹ OSEP used the Part C Timely and Accurate Data Rubric to award points to states based on the timeliness and accuracy of their 616 and 618 data. A copy of the rubric is contained in the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2014 SPP/APR in GRADS 360. On the first page of the rubric, entitled "Part C Timely and Accurate Data-SPP/APR Data" states are given one point for each indicator with valid and reliable data and five points for SPP/APRs that were submitted timely. The total points for valid and reliable SPP/APR data and timely submission are added together to form the APR Grand Total. On page two of the rubric, the State's 618 data is scored based on information provided to OSEP on 618 data timeliness, completeness, edit checks, and data notes from ED Facts. The percentage of Timely and Accurately Reported Data is calculated by adding the 618 Data Grand Total to the APR Grand Total and dividing this sum by the total number of points available for the entire rubric. This percentage is inserted into the Compliance Matrix.

- No Special Conditions on its FFY 2015 grant award that are in effect at the time of the 2016 determination.
- One point, if either or both of the following occurred:
 - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance, identified by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2012, FFY 2011, and/or FFY 2010, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the FFY 2014 OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2013 SPP/APR in GRADS 360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
 - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's FFY 2015 Part C grant award and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2016 determination.
- Zero points, if either or both of the following occurred:
 - The State has remaining findings of noncompliance identified, by OSEP or the State, in FFY 2009 or earlier, for which the State has not yet demonstrated correction (see the OSEP Response to the State's FFY 2014 SPP/APR in GRADS 360 for specific information regarding these remaining findings of noncompliance); and/or
 - The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's last three (FFYs 2013, 2014, and 2015) *IDEA* Part C grant awards, and those Special Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2016 determination.

Nevada

2016 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
81.25	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	8	5	62.50
Compliance	16	16	100

I. Results Component – Data Quality

Data Quality Total Score (completeness + anomalies)	4
--	----------

(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State's 2014 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e. outcome data)	1792
Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e. 618 exiting data)	2495
Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%)	71.82
Data Completeness Score²	2

(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in you State's FFY 2014 Outcomes Data

Data Anomalies Score³	2
---	----------

II. Results Component – Child Performance

Child Performance Total Score (state comparison + year to year comparison)	1
---	----------

(a) Comparing your State's 2014 Outcomes Data to other State's 2014 Outcomes Data

Data Comparison Score⁴	0
--	----------

(b) Comparing your State's FFY 2014 data to your State's FFY 2013 data

Performance Change Score⁵	1
---	----------

Summary Statement Performance	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1 (%)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS1 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS2 (%)
FFY 2014	63.32	37.56	68.67	36.61	61.11	37.44
FFY 2013	65.25	39.94	70.76	38.24	66.08	41.7

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2016: Part C."

² Please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation.

³ Please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation.

⁴ Please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation.

⁵ Please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation.

2016 Part C Compliance Matrix

Part C Compliance Indicator¹	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013	Score
Indicator 1: Timely service provision	97.57	No	2
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline	99.83	Yes	2
Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan	99.49	Yes	2
Indicator 8B: Transition notification	100	N/A	2
Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference	98.87	Yes	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Special Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

¹ The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Measurement Table at: <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/4603>

Appendix A

I. (a) Data Completeness:

The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2014 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State's FFY 2014 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2014 IDEA Section 618 data.

A percentage for your State was computed by dividing the number of children reported in your State's Indicator C3 data by the number of children your State reported exited during FFY 2014 in the State's FFY 2014 IDEA Section 618 Exit Data.

Data Completeness Score	Percent of Part C Children included in Outcomes Data (C3) and 618 Data
0	Lower than 34%
1	34% through 64%
2	65% and above

Appendix B

I. (b) Data Quality: Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2014 Outcomes Data

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2014 Indicator 3 Outcomes Data reported by your State. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2010 – FFY 2013 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C. For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using the publicly available data and a lower and upper scoring percentage was set 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for category a and 2 standard deviations above and below the mean for categories b through e. In any case where the low scoring percentage set from 1 or 2 standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2014 data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State's data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a 0 for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomalies score of 0, 1, or 2 is based on the total points awarded.

Outcome A	Positive Social Relationships
Outcome B	Knowledge and Skills
Outcome C	Actions to Meet Needs

Category a	Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning
Category b	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
Category c	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
Category d	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
Category e	Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

Outcome \ Category	Mean	StDev	-1SD	+1SD
Outcome A \ Category a	2.70%	6.26%	-3.55%	8.96%
Outcome B \ Category a	2.34%	5.92%	-3.59%	8.26%
Outcome C \ Category a	2.39%	6.73%	-4.34%	9.12%

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-2SD	+2SD
Outcome A\Category b	20.55%	8.32%	3.92%	37.19%
Outcome A \Category c	18.57%	10.88%	-3.19%	40.33%
Outcome A\Category d	28.38%	9.30%	9.78%	46.98%
Outcome A\Category e	29.79%	15.15%	-0.51%	60.10%
Outcome B\Category b	21.85%	8.89%	4.07%	39.63%
Outcome B\Category c	26.60%	11.24%	4.12%	49.08%
Outcome B\Category d	33.35%	8.66%	16.03%	50.67%
Outcome B\Category e	15.86%	10.58%	-5.29%	37.02%
Outcome C\Category b	18.53%	7.71%	3.11%	33.96%
Outcome C\Category c	21.19%	12.31%	-3.43%	45.82%
Outcome C\Category d	35.12%	10.05%	15.03%	55.22%
Outcome C\Category e	22.76%	15.06%	-7.36%	52.88%

Data Anomalies Score	Total Points Received in All Progress Areas
0	0 through 9 points
1	10 through 12 points
2	13 through 15 points

Data Quality: Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2014 Outcomes Data

Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP's Assessed in your State	1792
--	-------------

Outcome A – Positive Social Relationships	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	9	575	535	473	200
Performance (%)	0.5	32.09	29.85	26.4	11.16
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome B – Knowledge and Skills	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	7	520	609	546	110
Performance (%)	0.39	29.02	33.98	30.47	6.14
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome C – Actions to Meet Needs	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	7	637	477	535	136
Performance (%)	0.39	35.55	26.62	29.85	7.59
Scores	1	0	1	1	1

	Total Score
Outcome A	5
Outcome B	5
Outcome C	4
Outcomes A-C	14

Data Anomalies Score	2
-----------------------------	----------

Appendix C

II. (a) Comparing Your State's 2014 Outcomes Data to Other States' 2014 Outcome Data

This score represents how your State's FFY 2014 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2014 Outcomes Data. Your State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements for your State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States. The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement. Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned 0, 1, or 2 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned 0 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned 1 point, and if your State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile the Summary Statement was assigned 2 points. The points were added up across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive a total number of points between 0 and 12, with 0 points indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were at or below the 10th percentile and 12 points indicating all 6 Summary Statements were at or above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of 0, 1, or 2 was based on the total points awarded.

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Scoring Percentages for the 10th and 90th Percentile for Each Outcome and Summary Statement, FFY 2014

Percentiles	Outcome A SS1	Outcome A SS2	Outcome B SS1	Outcome B SS2	Outcome C SS1	Outcome C SS2
10	46.54%	44.80%	53.06%	36.61%	56.74%	41.46%
90	82.65%	69.75%	84.62%	62.95%	84.40%	72.91%

Data Comparison Score	Total Points Received Across SS1 and SS2
0	0 through 4 points
1	5 through 8 points
2	9 through 12 points

Your State's Summary Statement Performance FFY 2014

Summary Statement (SS)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS1	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS2
Performance (%)	63.32	37.56	68.67	36.61	61.11	37.44
Points	1	0	1	0	1	1

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2(*)	4
---	----------

Your State's Data Comparison Score	0
---	----------

Appendix D

II. (b) Comparing your State’s FFY 2014 data to your State’s FFY 2013 data

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year’s reporting (FFY 2013) is compared to the current year (FFY 2014) using the test of proportional difference to determine whether there is a statistically significant (or meaningful) growth or decline in child achievement based upon a significance level of $p < .05$. The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase across the years. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas are totaled, resulting in a score from 0 – 12.

Test of Proportional Difference Calculation Overview

The summary statement percentages from the previous year’s reporting were compared to the current year using an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon a significance level of $p < .05$. The statistical test has several steps.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2014 and FFY2013 summary statements.

e.g. C3A FFY2014% - C3A FFY2013% = Difference in proportions

Step 2: Compute the standard error of the difference in proportions using the following formula which takes into account the value of the summary statement from both years and the number of children that the summary statement is based on

$$\sqrt{\left(\frac{\text{FFY2013 \%} \cdot (1 - \text{FFY2013 \%})}{\text{FFY2013 } n} + \frac{\text{FFY2014 \%} \cdot (1 - \text{FFY2014 \%})}{\text{FFY2014 } n} \right)} = \text{Standard Error of Difference in Proportions}$$

Step 3: The difference in proportions is then divided by the standard error of the difference to compute a z score.

Difference in proportions / standard error of the difference in proportions = z score

Step 4: The statistical significance of the z score is located within a table and the p value is determined.

Step 5: The difference in proportions is coded as statistically significant if the p value is it is less than or equal to .05.

Step 6: Information about the statistical significance of the change and the direction of the change are combined to arrive at a score for the summary statement using the following criteria

0 = statistically significant decrease from FFY 2013 to FFY 2014

1 = No statistically significant change

2= statistically significant increase from FFY 2013 to FFY 2014

Step 7: The score for each summary statement and outcome is summed to create a total score with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 12. The score for the test of proportional difference is assigned a score for the Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score based on the following cut points:

Indicator 2 Overall Performance Change Score	Cut Points for Change Over Time in Summary Statements Total Score
0	Lowest score through 3
1	4 through 7
2	8 through highest

Summary Statement/ Child Outcome	FFY 2013 N	FFY 2013 Summary Statement (%)	FFY 2014 N	FFY 2014 Summary Statement (%)	Difference between Percentages (%)	Std Error	z value	p-value	p<=.05	Score 0 = significant decrease 1 = no significant change 2 = significant increase
SS1/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	1557	65.25	1592	63.32	-1.93	0.0213	-0.9061	0.3649	No	1
SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	1628	70.76	1682	68.67	-2.09	0.0191	-1.0923	0.2747	No	1
SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	1604	66.08	1656	61.11	-4.97	0.0211	-2.351	0.0187	Yes	0
SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	1760	39.94	1792	37.56	-2.38	0.0263	-0.9058	0.365	No	1
SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	1760	38.24	1792	36.61	-1.63	0.0256	-0.6139	0.5393	No	1
SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	1760	41.7	1792	37.44	-4.26	0.0261	-1.6304	0.103	No	1

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2 5

Your State's Performance Change Score 1

FFY 2014 APR Nevada

Part C Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8a	1	1
8b	1	1
8c	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
	Subtotal	12
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2014 SPP/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) =	17.0

618 Data					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Child Count/Settings Due Date: 4/1/2015	1	1	1	1	4
Exiting Due Date: 11/4/15	1	1	1	N/A	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/4/15	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	10
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.7) =		17.0

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	17.00
B. 618 Grand Total	17.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	34.00
Total NA Points Subtracted in APR	0.00
Total NA Points Subtracted in 618	0.00
Denominator	34.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.0

REMAINING FINDINGS OF NONCOMPLIANCE IDENTIFIED IN FFY 2011 AND FFY 2010, AS NOTED IN OSEP'S RESPONSE TO THE STATE'S FFY 2013 SPP/APR

(NEVADA PART C)

In its FFY 2012 SPP/APR, the State reported in prior Part C Indicator 9 (Timely Correction of Noncompliance) that there were one or more remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 or earlier. OSEP's June 30, 2015 Response to the State's FFY 2013 SPP/APR noted that the State had three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 and eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, and required the State to report, with the FFY 2014 SPP/APR, that it had corrected the remaining findings.

With its FFY 2014 SPP/APR, the State reported that the three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 and eight findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected.

Correction of Remaining Finding of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2011

Number of remaining FFY 2011 findings noted in OSEP's Response to the State's FFY 2013 SPP/APR	2
Number of remaining FFY 2011 findings the State has verified, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, as corrected	2
Number of remaining FFY 2011 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected	0

Correction of Remaining Finding of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2008

Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings noted in OSEP's Response to the State's FFY 2013 SPP/APR	8
Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has verified, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, as corrected	8
Number of remaining FFY 2008 findings the State has NOT verified as corrected	0

Nevada

IDEA Part C - Dispute Resolution

Year 2014-15

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the bottom of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	1
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	1
(1.1)(a) Reports with findings of noncompliance.	1
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines.	1
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines.	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	0
(2.1) Mediations held.	0
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations not held.	0

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	0
Has your state adopted Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(1) or Part B due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(2)?	Part B

(3.1) Resolution meetings (applicable ONLY for states using Part B due process hearing procedures).	0
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline.	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Hearings pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	0

Comment:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by Nevada. These data were generated on 10/19/2015 5:27 PM EDT.

OMB Number: 1820-0678

Part C and Part B 619 Data Display: NEVADA
 Publication Year 2016

Identification of Children with Disabilities (CWD)

NUMBER OF CHILDREN RECEIVING EARLY INTERVENTION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES UNDER IDEA,
 BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5

Student Category	Children with Disabilities (IDEA), State (#)	Children with Disabilities (IDEA), Nation (#)
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities, Birth to 3	2,889	350,581
Children with Disabilities, 3 through 5	8,537	753,697

Explanatory Note: The number of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state-designated child count date (one day between October 1 and December 1, 2014). Children with disabilities (IDEA) are served by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Data reported for IDEA 2014 Part B Child Count and Educational Environments and Part C Child Count and Settings. National counts for infants and toddlers represent the US and Outlying Areas and national counts for children with disabilities represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States. For the purposes of this chart, *infants and toddlers* represents ages birth to 3, *children* represents ages three through five. States have the option to report the cumulative number of infants and toddlers with disabilities, ages birth to 3, who received early intervention services at any time during the most recent 12-month period for which the data are available. If provided, this state reported that - infants and toddlers with disabilities, birth to 3, received early intervention services during the time period of to .

PERCENT OF POPULATION CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES (IDEA) BY AGE

Age	State (%) 2012	State (%) 2013	State (%) 2014	Nation (%) 2014
Birth to 1	1.13	0.81	1.12	1.15
1 to 2	2.23	2.19	2.42	2.74
2 to 3	3.85	4.18	4.81	4.97
Birth to 3	2.42	2.41	2.78	2.95
3 through 5	7.16	7.43	7.81	6.27

Explanatory Note: The percentage of the population, in the designated age range, who are children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation as of the state-designated child count date, for the ages birth through 5. Data reported for IDEA 2014 Part B Child Count and Educational Environments and Part C Child Count and Settings and Census. National counts for infants and toddlers, birth to age 3 represent the US and Outlying Areas; national counts for children with disabilities, ages 3 through 5 represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States; and national Census counts represent the 50 states, DC, and PR (including BIE).

RACE/ETHNICITY BY PERCENT, BIRTH THROUGH AGE 5

	Hispanic/ Latino (%)	Black or African American (%)	White (%)	Asian (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (%)	Two or more races (%)	All Race/ Ethnicities (%)
All Infants and Toddlers, Birth to 3	40.79	8.72	36.24	5.56	0.86	0.67	7.16	100.00
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities, Birth to 3	37.76	9.69	40.88	4.19	0.62	0.62	6.23	100.00
All Children, 3 through 5	41.32	8.81	36.63	5.06	0.83	0.57	6.79	100.00
Children with Disabilities, 3 through 5	39.32	12.23	37.25	2.71	0.94	0.91	6.64	100.00

Explanatory Note: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities, birth to 3, and children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 5, in a particular race/ethnicity category in the state. The numerator is the number of infants and toddlers with disabilities or children with disabilities (IDEA) in a race/ethnicity category as of the state-designated child count date (one day between October 1 and December 1, 2014) and the denominator is the total number of infants and toddlers with disabilities, birth to 3, or children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 5. The "All Infants and Toddlers" row is calculated using the total number of infants and toddlers in the population and the "All Children" row is calculated using the total number of children in the population. Data reported for IDEA 2014 Part B Child Count and Educational Environments and Part C Child Count and Settings and 2013-14 Census.

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 3 THROUGH 5

Disability Category	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5 State (%)	CWDs (IDEA), Ages 3-5, Nation (%)
All disabilities	100.00	100.00
Autism	12.67	8.85
Deaf-blindness	0.02	36.96
Developmental Delay	65.73	36.96
Emotional disturbance	0.02	0.39
Hearing impairment	0.91	1.20
Intellectual disability	1.10	1.88
Multiple disabilities	1.23	1.06
Orthopedic impairment	0.70	0.84
Other health impairment	2.07	3.14
Specific learning disabilities	0.19	1.41
Speech or language impairment	14.84	43.71
Traumatic brain injury	0.26	0.15
Visual impairment	0.25	0.39

Explanatory Note: The percentage represents a distribution of children with disabilities (IDEA) by disability category for ages 3 through 5. For this calculation, the denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 5. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States. Data reported for IDEA 2014 Part B Child Count and Educational Environments.

Early Intervention Settings and Preschool Educational Environments

PERCENTAGE OF INFANTS AND TODDLERS WITH DISABILITIES BY SETTINGS AND AGE, BIRTH TO 3

Age	Community-based Setting, State (%)	Community-based Setting, Nation (%)	Home, State (%)	Home, Nation (%)	Other Settings, State (%)	Other Settings, Nation (%)
Birth to 1	1.28	3.34	79.54	93.18	19.18	3.48
1 to 2	2.85	6.13	84.19	90.11	1.28	3.76
2 to 3	3.98	9.36	83.34	85.75	12.67	4.89
Birth to 3	3.29	7.58	83.07	88.06	13.64	4.35

Explanatory Note: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the state by age receiving early intervention services primarily in a community-based setting, home setting, or other setting. The numerator is the number of infants and toddlers with disabilities in a specific setting and age category as of the state-designated child count date (one day between October 1 and December 1, 2014) and the denominator is the total number of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the specified age category. National counts for infants and toddlers represent the US and Outlying Areas. Data reported for IDEA 2014 Part C Child Count and Settings.

PERCENTAGE OF INFANTS AND TODDLERS WITH DISABILITIES BY SETTINGS AND RACE/ETHNICITY, BIRTH TO 3

Race/Ethnicity	Community-based Setting, State (%)	Community-based Setting, Nation (%)	Home, State (%)	Home, Nation (%)	Other Settings, State (%)	Other Settings, Nation (%)
Hispanic/Latino	2.47	6.66	84.42	89.67	13.11	3.67
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.56	13.09	77.78	84.27	16.67	2.64
Asian	1.65	9.35	84.30	85.90	14.05	4.76
Black or African American	2.86	8.51	81.79	87.09	15.36	4.40
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5.56	5.23	72.22	89.20	22.22	5.57
White	4.23	6.64	82.39	89.07	13.38	4.29
Two or More Races	3.33	8.64	82.22	86.60	14.44	4.76

Explanatory Note: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the state by race/ethnicity category receiving early intervention services primarily in a community-based setting, home setting, or other setting. The numerator is the number of infants and toddlers with disabilities in a specific setting and race/ethnicity category as of the state-designated child count date (one day between October 1 and December 1, 2014) and the denominator is the total number of infants and toddlers with disabilities in a specified race/ethnicity category. National counts for infants and toddlers represent the US and Outlying Areas. Data reported for IDEA 2014 Part C Child Count and Settings.

PERCENT OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES BY DISABILITY CATEGORY, AGES 3 THROUGH 5

Disability Category	Number of CWDs (IDEA), State (#)	Number of CWDs (IDEA), Nation (#)	CWDs (IDEA) Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program, State (%)	CWDs (IDEA) Attending and Receiving the Majority of Special Education and Related Services in a Regular Early Childhood Program, Nation (%)	CWDs (IDEA) Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility, State (%)	CWDs (IDEA) Attending a Separate Special Education Class, Separate School, or Residential Facility, Nation (%)
All disabilities	8,537	753,697	27.0	43.7	56.1	25.7
Autism	1,082	66,738	7.1	34.3	85.5	47.0
Deaf-blindness	2	165	0.0	26.1	100.0	50.3
Developmental Delay	5,611	278,561	32.8	44.3	59.7	35.3
Emotional disturbance	2	2,909	0.0	47.4	50.0	19.8
Hearing impairment	78	9,042	24.4	38.1	73.1	40.5
Intellectual disability	94	14,168	2.1	25.5	94.7	42.5
Multiple disabilities	105	8,006	0.0	7.1	88.6	49.9
Orthopedic impairment	60	6,325	25.0	45.9	68.3	31.6
Other health impairment	177	23,652	19.8	46.6	65.0	27.6
Specific learning disabilities	16	10,646	68.8	51.3	18.8	16.0
Speech or language impairment	1,267	329,420	23.2	45.5	7.0	11.5
Traumatic brain injury	22	1,106	31.8	41.4	68.2	36.3
Visual impairment	21	2,959	33.3	48.2	61.9	29.3

Explanatory Note: The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) in the state and nation by disability category attending and receiving the majority of special education and related services in a regular early childhood program, or a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility. Note that this table does not include all reported preschool educational environment categories. The denominator is all children with disabilities (IDEA), ages 3 through 5, in a specified disability category. National data represent the US, Outlying Areas, and Freely Associated States. Data reported for IDEA 2014 Part B Child Count and Educational Environments.

EXITING BY PERCENTAGE RACE/ETHNICITY, BIRTH TO 3, 2013-2014

Age/ Exit Category (%)	All Race/ Ethnicities Nation (%)	Hispanic / Latino, State (%)	Hispanic / Latino Nation (%)	Black or African American, State (%)	Black or African American, Nation (%)	White, State (%)	White, Nation (%)	Asian, State (%)	Asian, Nation (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native, State (%)	American Indian or Alaska Native, Nation (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, State (%)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Nation (%)	TW or MC Rat Sta
8.22	13.85	8.08	11.39	5.38	9.94	9.30	16.70	11.63	9.99	8.33	10.07	5.00	13.38	
41.93	38.11	43.97	36.28	35.43	34.38	41.00	39.57	44.19	39.83	66.67	39.02	50.00	36.56	
0.00	3.05	0.00	3.25	0.00	4.35	0.00	2.64	0.00	4.55	0.00	1.57	0.00	2.11	
2.55	6.85	2.37	9.63	1.35	5.51	3.23	5.56	1.16	9.21	0.00	6.94	0.00	6.01	
1.42	3.10	0.97	1.94	0.00	2.93	2.05	3.80	3.49	2.22	0.00	3.80	0.00	2.95	
15.74	11.16	18.75	15.51	21.97	13.27	11.15	16.70	16.28	12.37	16.67	9.00	0.00	13.38	
0.61	0.33	0.75	0.28	0.90	0.53	0.59	0.30	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.63	
7.49	3.88	4.42	2.81	5.83	3.60	10.67	4.31	8.14	8.22	0.00	4.75	10.00	6.01	
11.98	12.13	10.78	10.89	8.22	11.81	13.80	12.90	5.81	5.25	0.00	11.27	20.00	13.07	
10.08	7.55	9.91	8.01	8.52	13.68	8.22	5.87	9.30	4.01	8.33	12.88	15.00	9.80	
100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	

Percent of infants and toddlers with disabilities who exit Part C by race/ethnicity category. The numerator is the number of infants and toddlers with disabilities in a particular exit category and the denominator is the number of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the particular race/ethnicity category. National counts for infants and toddlers represent the US reported for IDEA 2013-14 Part C Exiting.

Family Involvement

PART C, INDICATOR 4: FAMILY INVOLVEMENT (FFY 2014 APR, 2016)

Summary Statement: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family.	State (%)
Know their rights	97.2
Effectively communicate their children's current needs	93.5
Help their children develop and learn	96.9
Explanatory Note: State selected data source. Sampling is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state.	

Infants and Toddlers Outcomes

PART C, INDICATOR 3: INFANTS AND TODDLERS OUTCOMES (FFY 2014 APR, 2016)

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program in the outcome of:	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	63.3
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	68.7
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	61.1
Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	37.6
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	36.6
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	37.4
Explanatory Note: State selected data source. Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state. The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center provides a national summary of the outcomes for children served through IDEA's early childhood programs annually at http://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/pdfs/childoutcomeshighlights.pdf .	

Preschool Outcomes

PART B, INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES (FFY 2014 APR, 2016)

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in each of the following outcomes, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program in the outcome of:	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	74.0
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	75.2
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	71.2
Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each of the following outcomes by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program	State (%)
Positive social-emotional skills	55.0
Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	53.9
Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	59.7
Explanatory Note: State selected data source. Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. Sample must yield valid and reliable data and must be representative of the population sampled. N/A means the percentage is not applicable to the state. The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center provides a national summary of the outcomes for children served through IDEA's early childhood programs annually at http://ectacenter.org/eco/assets/pdfs/childoutcomeshighlights.pdf .	

References:

- x Data have been suppressed to protect personally identifiable information due to small cell counts.
- Data not available.
- * Data flagged due to questionable data quality. These data violated data quality edit checks. Additional information explaining the discrepancies in the data may be available in the accompanying data note documents.

Note: Sum of percentages may not equal 100 percent because of rounding.

References: Additional information clarifying states' data submissions are available in the data notes documents on <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/collection-documentation/index.html#datanotes>. Additional state-level data on children with disabilities (IDEA) can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/statelevel-data-files/index.html>, <http://www.data.gov>, <http://www.eddataexpress.ed.gov>, <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/>, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>, and <http://factfinder2.census.gov>. Information on U.S. Department of Education Special Education funding can be found at: <http://www2.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/osep/2014apps.html>.