

West Virginia's Annual Performance Targets for LEAs (2015-2016)

Instructions:

LEA level reports for the required State Performance Plan (SPP) /Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicators may be accessed by clicking on the tabs along the bottom of the Excel Workbook. Yes/No indicates whether or not a LEA met the indicator target. Counts ten or less will be masked (*) to protect students' personally identifiable information.

Indicator 1	Graduation for Students with IEPs
Indicator 2	Dropout for Students with IEPs
Indicator 3B	Assessment Participation for Students with IEPs
Indicator 3C	Assessment Performance for Students with IEPs
Indicator 4A	Long Term Suspension for Students with IEPs
Indicator 4B	Long Term Suspensions by Race/Ethnicity for Students with IEPs
Indicator 5	Educational Environment - Ages 6-21
Indicator 6	Educational Environment – Ages 3-5
Indicator 7	Early Childhood Outcomes for Children with IEPs
Indicator 8	Parent Involvement for Students with IEPs
Indicator 9	Disproportionality – All Disabilities
Indicator 10	Disproportionality – Specific Disabilities
Indicator 11	Child Find or Timely Initial Evaluations
Indicator 12	Early Childhood Transition (Part C to B)
Indicator 13	Secondary Transition for Students with IEPs
Indicator 14	Post School Outcomes for Exiters with IEPs
Indicator 15 & 16	Dispute Resolution and Mediation

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

The four year adjusted cohort graduation rate is number of students with IEPs who earned a regular diploma in four years divided by the sum of the total number of students with IEPs in the cohort for the four years of high school for this class.

Target: At least 70.67% of youth with IEPs graduated from high school with a regular diploma (Yes/No).

Note: Graduation data are lagged by one year per SPP/APR

LEA	LEA Graduation Rate	*Four-year graduation rate for students with disabilities (2014-2015) was at 70.67% or greater (Yes/No)
Barbour	71.43%	Yes
Berkeley	75.30%	Yes
Boone	74.19%	Yes
Braxton	70.00%	No
Brooke	89.19%	Yes
Cabell	54.81%	No
Calhoun	92.86%	Yes
Clay	75.00%	Yes
Doddridge	94.74%	Yes
Fayette	60.29%	No
Gilmer	61.54%	No
Grant	73.91%	Yes
Greenbrier	75.00%	Yes
Hampshire	48.00%	No
Hancock	65.00%	No
Hardy	77.78%	Yes
Harrison	69.91%	No
Jackson	75.00%	Yes
Jefferson	73.24%	Yes
Kanawha	56.25%	No
Lewis	55.00%	No
Lincoln	70.83%	Yes
Logan	63.27%	No
Marion	74.19%	Yes
Marshall	67.27%	No
Mason	72.00%	Yes

Mercer	61.70%	No
Mineral	90.70%	Yes
Mingo	68.75%	No
Monongalia	65.47%	No
Monroe	52.17%	No
Morgan	78.57%	Yes
McDowell	60.42%	No
Nicholas	77.46%	Yes
Ohio	70.73%	Yes
Pendleton	75.00%	Yes
Pleasants	80.00%	Yes
Pocahontas	73.33%	Yes
Preston	73.24%	Yes
Putnam	77.19%	Yes
Raleigh	57.94%	No
Randolph	59.52%	No
Ritchie	76.47%	Yes
Roane	77.78%	Yes
Summers	66.67%	No
Taylor	76.00%	Yes
Tucker	58.33%	No
Tyler	90.48%	Yes
Upshur	71.43%	Yes
Wayne	68.24%	No
Webster	86.67%	Yes
Wetzel	94.59%	Yes
Wirt	100.00%	Yes
Wood	72.63%	Yes
Wyoming	81.40%	Yes
STATE	69.23%	No

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

Dropout Rate Calculation for Students with Disabilities = The number students with disabilities who dropped out are divided by the number of students with disabilities in grades 7-12 X 100.

Target: 2.45% or less of youth with IEPs dropped out of high school.

Note: Dropout data are lagged by one year per SPP/APR measurement

LEA	LEA Dropout Rate	*SWDs Drop Rate (2014-2015) was \leq 2.45% (Yes/No)
Barbour	1.03%	Yes
Berkeley	1.57%	Yes
Boone	1.76%	Yes
Braxton	0.61%	Yes
Brooke	0.00%	Yes
Cabell	2.36%	Yes
Calhoun	0.00%	Yes
Clay	1.67%	Yes
Doddridge	0.00%	Yes
Fayette	3.17%	No
Gilmer	0.00%	Yes
Grant	0.00%	Yes
Greenbrier	0.49%	Yes
Hampshire	1.67%	Yes
Hancock	1.10%	Yes
Hardy	2.19%	Yes
Harrison	1.78%	Yes
Jackson	0.88%	Yes
Jefferson	1.01%	Yes
Kanawha	0.31%	Yes
Lewis	1.52%	Yes
Lincoln	0.00%	Yes
Logan	2.59%	No
Marion	1.20%	Yes
Marshall	0.69%	Yes

Mason	0.75%	Yes
Mercer	1.92%	Yes
Mineral	0.00%	Yes
Mingo	0.47%	Yes
Monongalia	0.78%	Yes
Monroe	2.99%	No
Morgan	0.00%	Yes
McDowell	0.00%	Yes
Nicholas	0.28%	Yes
Ohio	0.33%	Yes
Pendleton	1.32%	Yes
Pleasants	0.00%	Yes
Pocahontas	2.38%	Yes
Preston	2.57%	No
Putnam	0.75%	Yes
Raleigh	2.60%	No
Randolph	1.57%	Yes
Ritchie	0.00%	Yes
Roane	2.80%	No
Summers	2.41%	Yes
Taylor	0.81%	Yes
Tucker	1.12%	Yes
Tyler	0.89%	Yes
Upshur	2.89%	No
Wayne	0.78%	Yes
Webster	0.00%	Yes
Wetzel	1.40%	Yes
Wirt	2.04%	Yes
Wood	0.60%	Yes
Wyoming	2.73%	No
STATE	1.22%	Yes

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 3: Participation of children with IEPs on statewide assessments.

B. Participation rate for students with IEPs.

Target B: District's participation rate was 95% or higher for Math/RLA? Yes/No

District	District's Math Participation Rate	District's Math participation rate was 95% or greater (Yes/No)	District's RLA Participation Rate	District's RLA participation rate was 95% or greater (Yes/No)
State Totals	98.26%	Yes	98.28%	Yes
Barbour	98.37%	Yes	97.97%	Yes
Berkeley	98.34%	Yes	98.51%	Yes
Boone	96.45%	Yes	96.95%	Yes
Braxton	99.46%	Yes	99.46%	Yes
Brooke	98.49%	Yes	98.49%	Yes
Cabell	96.67%	Yes	97.04%	Yes
Calhoun	97.59%	Yes	97.59%	Yes
Clay	99.25%	Yes	99.25%	Yes
Doddridge	96.74%	Yes	96.74%	Yes
Fayette	97.56%	Yes	97.35%	Yes
Gilmer	100.00%	Yes	100.00%	Yes
Grant	99.37%	Yes	99.37%	Yes
Greenbrier	98.96%	Yes	98.96%	Yes
Hampshire	95.69%	Yes	96.26%	Yes
Hancock	98.58%	Yes	98.82%	Yes
Hardy	99.45%	Yes	100.00%	Yes
Harrison	98.49%	Yes	98.49%	Yes
ODTP	95.15%	Yes	92.23%	No
Jackson	99.28%	Yes	98.79%	Yes
Jefferson	97.33%	Yes	97.48%	Yes
Kanawha	97.58%	Yes	97.44%	Yes
Lewis	98.58%	Yes	98.58%	Yes
Lincoln	98.18%	Yes	98.18%	Yes
Logan	98.66%	Yes	98.66%	Yes
Marion	98.98%	Yes	99.19%	Yes
Marshall	98.31%	Yes	98.31%	Yes
Mason	97.19%	Yes	97.19%	Yes
Mercer	99.32%	Yes	99.32%	Yes
Mineral	97.76%	Yes	97.48%	Yes
Mingo	98.46%	Yes	98.46%	Yes
Monongalia	98.92%	Yes	98.68%	Yes
Monroe	99.27%	Yes	99.27%	Yes
Morgan	98.45%	Yes	98.97%	Yes
McDowell	98.65%	Yes	98.92%	Yes
Nicholas	98.81%	Yes	98.81%	Yes
Ohio	98.21%	Yes	98.21%	Yes
Pendleton	98.51%	Yes	98.51%	Yes
Pleasants	100.00%	Yes	100.00%	Yes
Pocahontas	97.87%	Yes	97.87%	Yes
Preston	99.53%	Yes	99.53%	Yes
Putnam	98.93%	Yes	98.81%	Yes
Raleigh	98.28%	Yes	98.28%	Yes
Randolph	99.35%	Yes	99.35%	Yes
Ritchie	99.30%	Yes	99.30%	Yes
Roane	98.46%	Yes	98.46%	Yes
Summers	96.46%	Yes	96.46%	Yes
Taylor	98.20%	Yes	99.10%	Yes
Tucker	95.77%	Yes	97.18%	Yes
Tyler	100.00%	Yes	100.00%	Yes
Upshur	97.78%	Yes	98.28%	Yes
Wayne	98.72%	Yes	98.57%	Yes
Webster	100.00%	Yes	98.40%	Yes
Wetzel	97.93%	Yes	97.93%	Yes
Wirt	100.00%	Yes	100.00%	Yes
Wood	97.53%	Yes	97.63%	Yes
WV Deaf & Blind	100.00%	Yes	100.00%	Yes
Wyoming	100.00%	Yes	100.00%	Yes

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 3C: Performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments.

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

Proficiency rate = number of students with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient divided by the total number of children with IEPs enrolled, calculated separately for reading and math

Proficiency rate includes the following performance levels: mastery, above mastery and distinguished. The denominator for all percentages is the number of students with disabilities in the grades assessed who were enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

District Name	District's Math Proficiency Rate	District's was Proficient in Math at 48.90% or greater (Yes/No)	District's RLA Proficiency Rate	District was Proficient in RLA at 46.90% or greater (Yes/No)
Barbour	8.26%	No	9.13%	No
Berkeley	11.96%	No	17.31%	No
Boone	17.37%	No	18.59%	No
Braxton	8.65%	No	15.14%	No
Brooke	16.21%	No	18.65%	No
Cabell	10.33%	No	13.14%	No
Calhoun	9.88%	No	12.35%	No
Clay	12.78%	No	15.79%	No
Doddridge	8.99%	No	8.99%	No
Fayette	7.31%	No	11.92%	No
Gilmer	9.09%	No	10.39%	No
Grant	5.70%	No	13.29%	No
Greenbrier	13.39%	No	21.13%	No
Hampshire	13.81%	No	19.10%	No
Hancock	18.23%	No	23.68%	No
Hardy	10.00%	No	10.50%	No
Harrison	8.83%	No	12.67%	No
ODTP	1.02%	No	1.05%	No
Jackson	14.36%	No	16.38%	No
Jefferson	17.84%	No	19.79%	No
Kanawha	14.01%	No	18.34%	No
Lewis	1.44%	No	3.85%	No
Lincoln	7.89%	No	11.83%	No
Logan	7.48%	No	7.26%	No
Marion	12.32%	No	15.16%	No
Marshall	6.55%	No	9.31%	No

Mason	6.07%	No
Mercer	6.86%	No
Mineral	7.74%	No
Mingo	21.09%	No
Monongalia	8.01%	No
Monroe	4.41%	No
Morgan	7.85%	No
McDowell	5.75%	No
Nicholas	8.76%	No
Ohio	20.30%	No
Pendleton	7.58%	No
Pleasants	8.33%	No
Pocahontas	14.13%	No
Preston	5.18%	No
Putnam	16.31%	No
Raleigh	10.18%	No
Randolph	10.46%	No
Ritchie	8.45%	No
Roane	14.84%	No
Summers	2.75%	No
Taylor	14.22%	No
Tucker	13.24%	No
Tyler	12.69%	No
Upshur	3.78%	No
Wayne	13.44%	No
Webster	10.40%	No
Wetzel	11.81%	No
Wirt	11.69%	No
Wood	11.59%	No
WVSDB	4.84%	No
Wyoming	5.29%	No
State	11.02%	No

	10.40%	No
	11.52%	No
	8.62%	No
	19.92%	No
	12.17%	No
	8.09%	No
	12.50%	No
	7.10%	No
	14.20%	No
	31.52%	No
	13.64%	No
	15.74%	No
	15.22%	No
	7.53%	No
	22.33%	No
	13.35%	No
	16.67%	No
	14.79%	No
	18.75%	No
	10.09%	No
	17.27%	No
	8.70%	No
	17.16%	No
	5.76%	No
	15.48%	No
	11.38%	No
	13.50%	No
	15.58%	No
	15.56%	No
	11.29%	No
	12.96%	No
	14.85%	No

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. (Or a rate of 3.28% or greater).

B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. (Or a rate of 3.28% or greater).

And

Policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Note: ***The data are lagged by one year per SPP/APR measurement table specifications. (2014-2015)**

	Indicator 4A	Indicator 4B
	District had a significant discrepancy of suspension/expulsions > than 10 days for SWDs (Yes/No)	District had a significant discrepancy as a result of policies, procedures, and practices for race/ethnicity (Yes/No)
Barbour	No	No
Berkeley	No	No
Boone	No	No
Braxton	No	No
Brooke	No	No
Cabell	No	No
Calhoun	No	No
Clay	No	No
Doddridge	No	No
Fayette	No	No
Gilmer	No	No
Grant	No	No
Greenbrier	No	No
Hampshire	No	No
Hancock	No	No
Hardy	No	No

Harrison	No	Yes
ODTP	No	No
Jackson	No	No
Jefferson	No	No
Kanawha	Yes	Yes
Lewis	Yes	No
Lincoln	No	No
Logan	No	No
Marion	No	Yes
Marshall	No	No
Mason	No	No
Mercer	No	No
Mineral	No	No
Mingo	No	No
Monongalia	No	No
Monroe	No	No
Morgan	No	No
McDowell	No	No
Nicholas	No	No
Ohio	No	No
Pendleton	No	No
Pleasants	No	No
Pocahontas	No	No
Preston	No	No
Putnam	No	No
Raleigh	No	No
Randolph	No	No
Ritchie	No	No
Roane	No	No
Summers	No	No
Taylor	No	No
Tucker	No	No
Tyler	No	No
Upshur	No	No
Wayne	No	No
Webster	No	No
Wetzel	No	No
Wirt	No	No
Wood	No	No
WVSDB	No	No
Wyoming	No	No
State	No	No

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 5: Percent of students with IEPs age 6 through 21:

- A. The percent of students with IEPs ages 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day
- B. The percent of students with IEPs ages 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day
- C. The percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements

December 1 2015 Child Count Data										
County Name	Total School Age Child Count	Indicator 5A Counts		Indicator 5B Counts		Indicator 5C Counts				
		Number of Children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	5A: Met 62.50% Target = (Yes/No)	Number of Children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside the regular class 40% of the day	5B: Met ≤ 8.9% Target (Yes/No)	Number of Children with IEPs aged 6-21 inside Separate School, Residential Facilities, or Homebound/Hospital Placements	5C: Met ≤ 1.4% Target (Yes/No)			
BARBOUR	399	292	73.18%	Yes	41	10.28%	No	*	0.50%	Yes
BERKELEY	2822	1836	65.06%	Yes	235	8.33%	Yes	51	1.81%	No
BOONE	677	447	66.03%	Yes	53	7.83%	Yes	*	0.74%	Yes
BRAXTON	326	265	81.29%	Yes	21	6.44%	Yes	*	0.31%	Yes
BROOKE	633	459	72.51%	Yes	61	9.64%	No	*	0.79%	Yes
CABELL	1782	1293	72.56%	Yes	145	8.14%	Yes	41	2.30%	No
CALHOUN	135	103	76.30%	Yes	*	4.44%	Yes	*	0.00%	Yes
CLAY	249	198	79.52%	Yes	13	5.22%	Yes	*	1.61%	No
DODDRIDGE	170	99	58.24%	No	*	1.18%	Yes	*	1.18%	Yes
FAYETTE	827	430	52.00%	No	119	14.39%	No	8	0.97%	Yes
GILMER	124	75	60.48%	No	*	4.84%	Yes	8	0.00%	Yes
GRANT	271	227	83.76%	Yes	21	7.75%	Yes	*	0.00%	Yes
GREENBRIER	839	383	45.65%	No	63	7.51%	Yes	16	1.91%	No
HAMPSHIRE	617	434	70.34%	Yes	49	7.94%	Yes	17	2.76%	No
HANCOCK	805	550	68.32%	Yes	85	10.56%	No	*	1.24%	Yes
HARDY	333	292	87.69%	Yes	*	1.50%	Yes	*	0.90%	Yes
HARRISON	1819	1304	71.69%	Yes	64	3.52%	Yes	15	0.82%	Yes
ODTP	173	125	72.25%	Yes	*	0.00%	NA	*	0.00%	NA
JACKSON	783	549	70.11%	Yes	53	6.77%	Yes	*	0.38%	Yes
JEFFERSON	1174	671	57.16%	No	84	7.16%	Yes	27	2.39%	No
KANAWHA	3629	2339	61.70%	No	540	14.88%	No	74	2.04%	No
LEWIS	381	262	68.77%	Yes	17	4.46%	Yes	*	0.52%	Yes
LINCOLN	774	448	57.88%	No	22	2.84%	Yes	*	0.90%	Yes
LOGAN	744	489	65.73%	Yes	42	5.65%	Yes	20	2.69%	No
MARION	955	666	69.74%	Yes	26	2.72%	Yes	*	0.94%	Yes
MARSHALL	536	397	74.07%	Yes	52	9.70%	No	*	1.49%	No
MASON	580	402	69.31%	Yes	47	8.10%	No	12	2.07%	No
MERCER	1229	602	48.98%	No	197	16.03%	No	18	1.46%	No
MINERAL	682	553	81.09%	Yes	41	6.01%	Yes	*	0.44%	Yes
MINGO	461	313	67.90%	Yes	33	7.16%	Yes	*	1.08%	Yes
MONONGALIA	1372	816	59.48%	No	101	7.36%	Yes	*	0.73%	Yes
MONROE	253	181	71.54%	Yes	*	3.16%	Yes	*	1.98%	No
MORGAN	333	239	71.77%	Yes	*	2.40%	Yes	*	1.50%	No
MCDOWELL	577	269	46.62%	No	40	6.93%	Yes	*	1.04%	Yes
NICHOLAS	584	445	76.20%	Yes	25	4.28%	Yes	17	2.91%	No
OHIO	689	457	66.33%	Yes	104	15.09%	No	*	0.87%	Yes
PENDLETON	124	91	73.39%	Yes	*	8.06%	Yes	*	1.61%	No
PLEASANTS	179	128	71.51%	Yes	12	6.70%	Yes	*	0.00%	Yes
POCAHONTAS	151	131	86.75%	Yes	*	3.97%	Yes	*	0.00%	Yes
PRESTON	764	435	56.94%	No	56	7.33%	Yes	*	0.92%	Yes
PUTNAM	1536	842	54.82%	No	180	11.72%	No	38	2.47%	No
RALEIGH	1599	1035	68.99%	Yes	144	9.54%	No	39	2.38%	No
RANDOLPH	552	421	76.27%	Yes	25	4.53%	Yes	*	1.27%	Yes
RITCHIE	201	123	61.19%	No	21	10.45%	No	*	1.00%	Yes
ROANE	298	194	65.10%	Yes	23	7.72%	Yes	*	0.34%	Yes
SUMMERS	180	92	51.11%	No	*	4.44%	Yes	*	2.78%	No
TAYLOR	380	244	64.21%	Yes	29	7.63%	Yes	*	0.26%	Yes
TUCKER	130	121	93.08%	Yes	*	3.08%	Yes	*	0.00%	Yes
TYLER	233	131	56.22%	No	13	5.58%	Yes	*	0.43%	Yes
UPSHUR	646	435	67.34%	Yes	26	4.02%	Yes	18	2.79%	No
WAYNE	1253	751	59.94%	No	77	6.15%	Yes	*	0.56%	Yes
WEBSTER	283	172	60.78%	Yes	*	2.46%	Yes	*	1.48%	No
WETZEL	425	248	58.35%	No	12	2.82%	Yes	*	0.47%	Yes
WIRT	150	103	68.67%	Yes	*	3.33%	Yes	*	2.00%	No
WOOD	1802	1164	64.59%	Yes	145	8.05%	Yes	18	1.00%	Yes
WYBEB	114	*	0.00%	NA	*	0.00%	NA	121	100.00%	NA
WYOMING	726	303	41.74%	No	21	2.89%	Yes	*	1.10%	Yes
STATE	40293	25974	64.46%	Yes	3251	8.07%	Yes	694	1.72%	No

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 6 - Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: (Dec. 1, 2015 Child Count Data)

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

County Name	Count of children in RECP and receiving majority of services in RECP	Indicator 6A = [Count RECP and receiving majority of services in RECP /Total PreK Count]*100 Target (= or > 31.30%)			Count of children in special education class, spearate school or residential facility	Indicator 6B = [Count of children in special education class, spearate school or residential facility /Total PreK Count]*100 Target Met or Exceeded (= or < 10.50%)		
BARBOUR	29	63.04%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
BERKELEY	118	34.81%	Yes	26		7.67%	Yes	
BOONE	35	58.33%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
BRAXTON	14	25.93%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
BROOKE	*	1.19%	No	25		29.76%	No	
CABELL	33	12.69%	No	38		14.62%	No	
CALHOUN	11	57.89%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
CLAY	*	20.41%	No	*		16.33%	No	
DODDRIDGE	16	76.19%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
FAYETTE	60	53.10%	Yes	*		6.19%	Yes	
GILMER	*	0.00%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
GRANT	13	40.63%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
GREENBRIER	31	38.75%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
HAMPSHIRE	25	24.75%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
HANCOCK	40	41.24%	Yes	*		6.19%	Yes	
HARDY	15	28.85%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
HARRISON	72	33.33%	Yes	*		3.70%	Yes	
ODTP	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	
JACKSON	24	27.27%	No	*		1.14%	Yes	
JEFFERSON	13	9.56%	No	27		19.85%	No	
KANAWHA	80	24.32%	No	19		5.78%	Yes	
LEWIS	*	33.33%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
LINCOLN	20	28.17%	No	*		1.41%	Yes	
LOGAN	22	28.95%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
MARION	52	48.15%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
MARSHALL	*	15.87%	No	23		36.51%	No	
MASON	45	57.69%	Yes	*		3.85%	Yes	
MERCER	82	45.56%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
MINERAL	*	7.76%	No	18		15.52%	No	
MINGO	20	30.30%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
MONONGALIA	58	56.31%	Yes	*		0.97%	Yes	
MONROE	15	31.25%	No	*		4.17%	Yes	
MORGAN	23	60.53%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
MCDOWELL	*	15.38%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
NICHOLAS	13	16.88%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
OHIO	*	4.47%	No	46		25.70%	No	
PENDLETON	*	11.76%	No	*		23.53%	No	
PLEASANTS	*	57.14%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
POCAHONTAS	15	100.00%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
PRESTON	20	20.62%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
PUTNAM	*	1.78%	No	37		21.89%	No	
RALEIGH	66	28.70%	No	15		6.52%	Yes	
RANDOLPH	23	35.38%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
RITCHIE	50	98.04%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
ROANE	*	17.24%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
SUMMERS	18	52.94%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
TAYLOR	30	57.69%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
TUCKER	*	31.25%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
TYLER	11	40.74%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
UPSHUR	17	28.81%	No	*		0.00%	Yes	
WAYNE	28	17.61%	No	22		13.84%	No	
WEBSTER	*	41.18%	Yes	*		5.88%	Yes	
WETZEL	17	37.78%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
WIRT	16	40.00%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
WOOD	22	8.21%	No	30		11.19%	No	
WVSDB	*	0.00%	NA	*		100.00%	NA	
WYOMING	122	97.60%	Yes	*		0.00%	Yes	
STATE	1518	30.34%	No	378		7.55%	Yes	

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 7 - Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

*To meet target, both targets must be met

County Name	Indicator 7A Targets: S1=78.00%; S2=67.00%	Indicator 7A	Indicator 7B Targets: S1=78.00%; S2=63.00%	Indicator 7B	Indicator 7C Targets: S1=79.00%; S2=78.00%	Indicator 7C
BARBOUR	S1=55.56%; S2=76.47%	Not Met	S1=72.73%; S2=64.71%	Not Met	S1=85.71%; S2=82.35%	Met
BERKELEY	S1=83.78%; S2=70.57%	Met	S1=81.25%; S2=64.89%	Met	S1=88.68%; S2=77.30%	Not Met
BOONE	S1=36.36%; S2=23.08%	Not Met	S1=27.27%; S2=15.38%	Not Met	S1=40.00%; S2=30.77%	Not Met
BRAXTON	S1=88.24%; S2=66.67%	Not Met	S1=85.71%; S2=55.33%	Not Met	S1=97.30%; S2=80.00%	Met
BROOKE	S1=100%; S2=58.71%	Not Met	S1=100%; S2=76.19%	Met	S1=100%; S2=95.24%	Met
CABELL	S1=88.76%; S2=56.77%	Not Met	S1=92.74%; S2=52.08%	Not Met	S1=91.84%; S2=73.96%	Not Met
CALHOUN	S1=80.00%; S2=66.67%	Not Met	S1=66.67%; S2=50.00%	Not Met	S1=75.00%; S2=83.33%	Not Met
CLAY	S1=75.00%; S2=61.11%	Not Met	S1=92.31%; S2=72.22%	Met	S1=71.43%; S2=72.22%	Not Met
DODDRIDGE	S1=81.82%; S2=75.00%	Met	S1=60.00%; S2=67.86%	Not Met	S1=87.50%; S2=85.71%	Met
FAYETTE	S1=52.27%; S2=35.29%	Not Met	S1=55.56%; S2=33.33%	Not Met	S1=61.11%; S2=54.90%	Not Met
GILMER	S1=100%; S2=100%	Met	S1=100%; S2=100%	Met	S1=100%; S2=100%	Met
GRANT	S1=90.48%; S2=46.15%	Not Met	S1=79.17%; S2=30.77%	Not Met	S1=100%; S2=80.77%	Met
GREENBRIER	S1=84.85%; S2=55.26%	Not Met	S1=83.33%; S2=44.74%	Not Met	S1=81.48%; S2=60.53%	Not Met
HAMPSHIRE	S1=85.71%; S2=54.17%	Not Met	S1=85.71%; S2=50.00%	Not Met	S1=86.67%; S2=66.67%	Not Met
HANCOCK	S1=91.30%; S2=73.81%	Met	S1=90.91%; S2=77.38%	Met	S1=95.00%; S2=83.33%	Met
HARDY	S1=70.00%; S2=30.00%	Not Met	S1=60.00%; S2=20.00%	Not Met	S1=60.00%; S2=60.00%	Not Met
HARRISON	S1=80.91%; S2=69.51%	Met	S1=84.87%; S2=66.46%	Met	S1=85.87%; S2=78.66%	Met
ODTP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
JACKSON	S1=91.67%; S2=89.01%	Met	S1=94.64%; S2=85.71%	Met	S1=97.06%; S2=96.70%	Met
JEFFERSON	S1=93.75%; S2=74.07%	Met	S1=86.67%; S2=74.07%	Met	S1=100%; S2=85.19%	Met
KANAWHA	S1=77.08%; S2=74.86%	Not Met	S1=77.14%; S2=68.85%	Not Met	S1=78.75%; S2=79.23%	Not Met
LEWIS	S1=87.50%; S2=78.26%	Met	S1=60.00%; S2=60.87%	Not Met	S1=33.33%; S2=78.26%	Not Met
LINCOLN	S1=91.84%; S2=62.71%	Not Met	S1=90.74%; S2=57.63%	Not Met	S1=91.30%; S2=71.19%	Not Met
LOGAN	S1=81.13%; S2=64.71%	Not Met	S1=82.69%; S2=67.65%	Met	S1=78.72%; S2=72.06%	Not Met
MARION	S1=84.00%; S2=80.85%	Met	S1=82.14%; S2=78.72%	Met	S1=85.00%; S2=85.11%	Met
MARSHALL	S1=78.33%; S2=59.74%	Not Met	S1=81.97%; S2=58.44%	Not Met	S1=76.79%; S2=66.23%	Not Met
MASON	S1=85.71%; S2=62.50%	Not Met	S1=76.92%; S2=54.17%	Not Met	S1=85.29%; S2=60.42%	Not Met
MERCER	S1=89.93%; S2=76.24%	Met	S1=90.73%; S2=75.69%	Met	S1=91.34%; S2=80.66%	Met
MINERAL	S1=73.53%; S2=74.14%	Not Met	S1=72.73%; S2=62.07%	Not Met	S1=70.83%; S2=84.48%	Not Met
MINGO	S1=53.33%; S2=66.67%	Not Met	S1=66.67%; S2=70.37%	Not Met	S1=55.56%; S2=77.78%	Not Met
MONONGALIA	S1=86.59%; S2=66.67%	Not Met	S1=87.36%; S2=59.26%	Not Met	S1=84.72%; S2=77.78%	Not Met
MONROE	S1=61.11%; S2=42.86%	Not Met	S1=63.16%; S2=33.33%	Not Met	S1=55.56%; S2=42.86%	Not Met
MORGAN	S1=75.00%; S2=61.54%	Not Met	S1=82.35%; S2=57.69%	Not Met	S1=85.71%; S2=73.08%	Not Met
MCDOWELL	S1=69.23%; S2=61.76%	Not Met	S1=68.00%; S2=61.76%	Not Met	S1=68.18%; S2=70.59%	Not Met
NICHOLAS	S1=82.76%; S2=85.00%	Met	S1=88.89%; S2=75.00%	Met	S1=79.17%; S2=87.50%	Met
OHIO	S1=90.21%; S2=74.32%	Met	S1=88.64%; S2=71.62%	Met	S1=94.59%; S2=82.43%	Met
PENDLETON	S1=100%; S2=50.00%	Not Met	S1=100%; S2=75.00%	Met	S1=100%; S2=50.00%	Not Met
PLEASANTS	S1=87.50%; S2=78.57%	Met	S1=80.00%; S2=71.43%	Met	S1=80.00%; S2=85.71%	Met
POCAHONTAS	S1=100%; S2=50.00%	Not Met	S1=100%; S2=50.00%	Not Met	S1=100%; S2=100%	Met
PRESTON	S1=73.58%; S2=64.10%	Not Met	S1=67.80%; S2=55.13%	Not Met	S1=72.92%; S2=70.51%	Not Met
PUTNAM	S1=86.11%; S2=58.54%	Not Met	S1=83.78%; S2=56.10%	Not Met	S1=90.91%; S2=70.73%	Not Met
RALEIGH	S1=81.48%; S2=73.66%	Met	S1=83.10%; S2=66.83%	Met	S1=87.62%; S2=81.95%	Met
RANDOLPH	S1=97.62%; S2=84.78%	Met	S1=95.24%; S2=82.61%	Met	S1=97.30%; S2=86.96%	Met
RITCHEE	S1=90.00%; S2=73.91%	Met	S1=85.71%; S2=69.57%	Met	S1=83.33%; S2=65.22%	Not Met
ROANE	S1=93.75%; S2=87.50%	Met	S1=88.89%; S2=87.50%	Met	S1=100%; S2=91.67%	Met
SUMMERS	S1=83.33%; S2=71.43%	Met	S1=87.50%; S2=71.43%	Met	S1=90.91%; S2=85.71%	Met
TAYLOR	S1=79.31%; S2=64.10%	Not Met	S1=81.25%; S2=53.85%	Not Met	S1=84.62%; S2=64.10%	Not Met
TUCKER	S1=60.00%; S2=33.33%	Not Met	S1=50.00%; S2=66.67%	Not Met	S1=33.33%; S2=66.67%	Not Met
TYLER	S1=85.71%; S2=90.00%	Met	S1=100%; S2=100%	Met	S1=100%; S2=100%	Met
UPSHUR	S1=54.17%; S2=53.85%	Not Met	S1=72.41%; S2=53.85%	Not Met	S1=83.33%; S2=79.49%	Met
WAYNE	S1=85.12%; S2=52.78%	Not Met	S1=84.13%; S2=51.39%	Not Met	S1=87.04%; S2=66.67%	Not Met
WEBSTER	S1=100%; S2=69.23%	Met	S1=83.33%; S2=61.54%	Not Met	S1=90.00%; S2=69.23%	Not Met
WETZEL	S1=88.24%; S2=62.96%	Not Met	S1=78.95%; S2=55.56%	Not Met	S1=92.86%; S2=74.07%	Not Met
WIRT	S1=50.00%; S2=76.92%	Not Met	S1=100%; S2=84.62%	Met	S1=100%; S2=100%	Met
WOOD	S1=71.60%; S2=61.86%	Not Met	S1=75.00%; S2=52.54%	Not Met	S1=83.33%; S2=75.42%	Not Met
WVSDB	S1=77.78%; S2=30.00%	Not Met	S1=77.78%; S2=40.00%	Not Met	S1=77.78%; S2=40.00%	Not Met
WYOMING	S1=78.26%; S2=60.00%	Not Met	S1=84.78%; S2=58.18%	Not Met	S1=85.00%; S2=69.09%	Not Met
State	S1=82.76%; S2=67.46%	Met	S1=82.90%; S2=63.06%	Met	S1=85.76%; S2=76.50%	Not Met

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 8 – 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.

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

Target: 35% of parents report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. To collect statewide and district-level data regarding parent partnership efforts, the West Virginia Department of Education, Office of Special Programs (OSP) conducted the School Efforts to Partner with Parents survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). **The survey is conducted according to a sampling plan approved by OSEP. All districts will be surveyed once within a six-year period. The data below is based on the 19, or 1/3 of the districts.*

Part B Partnership Effects Measure

Standard - 95% likelihood of a response of "agree", "strongly agree" or "very strongly agree" with item on Partnership Effort Scale: "The school explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school." Target = 35% of the parents responded at or above the standard.

District	Number of Surveys Sent	Number of Surveys Returned	Percent Response Rate	Count of responses at or above the standard	Did District Meet the Percent of responses at or above the 35.00% Target? (Yes/No)	95% Confidence Interval (Low)	95% Confidence Interval (High)
Berkeley	3,091	886	29.0%	308	(36%) Yes	32.80%	39.21%
Calhoun	95	28	29.0%	6	(21%) No	10.00%	40.00%
Doddridge	182	40	22.0%	12	(30%) No	18.06%	45.58%
Fayette	851	184	22.0%	69	(38%) Yes	31.37%	45.39%
Gilmer	143	36	25.0%	11	(31%) No	17.98%	47.02%
Hampshire	684	131	19.0%	39	(30%) No	22.98%	38.68%
Jefferson	1220	238	20.0%	63	(27%) No	21.46%	32.71%
Lewis	391	90	23.0%	23	(26%) No	17.87%	35.89%
Lincoln	758	128	17.0%	44	(35%) Yes	26.94%	43.29%
Marion	1055	212	20.0%	74	(35%) Yes	29.25%	42.11%
Marshall	560	114	20.0%	49	(43%) Yes	34.60%	52.58%
Mason	629	127	20.0%	42	(33%) No	25.50%	41.68%
Mineral	788	166	21.0%	70	(43%) Yes	35.37%	50.34%
McDowell	558	94	17.0%	26	(29%) No	20.31%	38.64%
Pleasants	194	35	18.0%	9	(26%) No	14.08%	42.33%
Pocahontas	167	35	21.0%	7	(21%) No	10.17%	37.20%
Tucker	148	30	20.0%	11	(38%) Yes	22.72%	56.07%
Webster	160	37	23.0%	10	(27%) No	15.34%	43.20%
Wetzel	453	93	21.0%	26	(28%) No	19.85%	37.88%
Wood	1958	410	21.0%	153	(38%) Yes	33.11%	42.50%
Total	14085	3114	22.0%	1052	(34%) No	32.71%	36.07%

Note: The percentage of parents at or above the standard is based on the number of surveys received from parents with at least one survey item response. This percentage calculation does not include surveys that were received blank or with only demographic data.

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100. Overrepresentation occurs when the proportion of students in racial and ethnic groups is higher in special education than in the general population. For a district, disproportionate representation is defined as a weighted risk ratio of 2.0 or higher for a racial or ethnic group being identified. When any group reaches a cell size of 20 or more, the analysis is reported. The weighted risk ratio method was selected because it is a more reliable method for states with smaller minority populations.

Calculating disproportionate representation is the first step in the process for determining whether districts inappropriately identified students. The second step is determining whether the disproportionate numbers are a result of inappropriate policies, practices and procedures related not only to discriminatory prereferral, referral and evaluation practices, which are important, but also to access to educational opportunities including effective instruction, access to and participation in the general curriculum and consideration of achievement data that are analyzed to guide instructional improvement. The districts meeting the definition of disproportionate representation based data are required to conduct the review and submit the completed rubric to WVDE as part of the District Self-Assessment. Upon submission, WVDE compliance staff reviews the documentation and determines the districts with disproportionate representation that was a result of inappropriate identification.

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Percent = [(# of districts 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)] times 100.

The same procedures are followed as in Indicator 9 but the data is analyzed for overrepresentation of specific disability groups according to racial and ethnic groups. Once a group has been identified as being over- or underrepresented the district completes a self-assessment to determine whether that identification was the result of inappropriate policies, practices and/or procedures. The Office of Special Program staff verifies this process and provides technical assistance and follow-up to the districts as needed.

Targets: 0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

County	Indicator 9: Target or Not Met
BARBOUR	Met
BERKELEY	Met
BOONE	Met
BRAXTON	Met
BROOKE	Met
CABELL	Met
CALHOUN	Met
CLAY	Met
DODDRIDGE	Met
FAYETTE	Met
GILMER	Met
GRANT	Met
GREENBRIER	Met
HAMPSHIRE	Met
HANCOCK	Met
HARDY	Met
HARRISON	Met
ODTP	Met
JACKSON	Met
JEFFERSON	Met
KANAWHA	Met
LEWIS	Met
LINCOLN	Met
LOGAN	Met
MARION	Met
MARSHALL	Met
MASON	Met
MERCER	Met
MINERAL	Met
MINGO	Met
MONONGALIA	Met
MONROE	Met
MORGAN	Met
MCDOWELL	Met
NICHOLAS	Met
OHIO	Met
PENDLETON	Met
PLEASANTS	Met
POCAHONTAS	Met
PRESTON	Met
PUTNAM	Met
RALEIGH	Met
RANDOLPH	Met
RITCHIE	Met
ROANE	Met
SUMMERS	Met
TAYLOR	Met
TUCKER	Met
TYLER	Met
UPSHUR	Met
WAYNE	Met
WEBSTER	Met
WETZEL	Met

County	Indicator 10: Target or Not Met
BARBOUR	Met
BERKELEY	Met
BOONE	Met
BRAXTON	Met
BROOKE	Met
CABELL	Met
CALHOUN	Met
CLAY	Met
DODDRIDGE	Met
FAYETTE	Met
GILMER	Met
GRANT	Met
GREENBRIER	Met
HAMPSHIRE	Met
HANCOCK	Met
HARDY	Met
HARRISON	Met
ODTP	Met
JACKSON	Met
JEFFERSON	Met
KANAWHA	Met
LEWIS	Met
LINCOLN	Met
LOGAN	Met
MARION	Met
MARSHALL	Met
MASON	Met
MERCER	Met
MINERAL	Met
MINGO	Met
MONONGALIA	Met
MONROE	Met
MORGAN	Met
MCDOWELL	Met
NICHOLAS	Met
OHIO	Met
PENDLETON	Met
PLEASANTS	Met
POCAHONTAS	Met
PRESTON	Met
PUTNAM	Met
RALEIGH	Met
RANDOLPH	Met
RITCHIE	Met
ROANE	Met
SUMMERS	Met
TAYLOR	Met
TUCKER	Met
TYLER	Met
UPSHUR	Met
WAYNE	Met
WEBSTER	Met
WETZEL	Met

WIRT	Met
WOOD	Met
WVSDB	Met
WYOMING	Met

WIRT	Met
WOOD	Met
WVSDB	Met
WYOMING	Met

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline - WV is 80-days).

Students for whom parental consent for initial evaluation was obtained and that were either found eligible or not eligible for special education services within the 80-day timeframe established by West Virginia Policy 2419.

Percent = number of students who were found not eligible within 80 days plus the number of students found eligible within 80 days divided by the number of students for whom parental consent for the initial evaluation was obtained X 100.

Target: 100% of students with parent consent for initial evaluation have evaluations completed within the 80-day timeframe established by West Virginia Policy 2419.

Note: Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, WV revised Policy 2419, Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities, to include Reason Late Code 01 (Extenuating circumstances resulting in school closure; state of emergency determined by the governor of West Virginia, weather conditions determined by the county superintendent, and summer break) as an acceptable late code.

**For acceptable reason code 01, the timeline will be extended directly proportional to the duration of the state of emergency, weather, or summer break. Reason Late Code 01 was verified using the District and State closure reports provided to the Part B data manager by West Virginia Department of Education. In the event that the Reason Late Code 01 was not utilized appropriately, the District was notified and corrections were required in the WV Education Information System (WVEIS) where all initial evaluations are recorded.

District Name	Number of Referrals with Consent	Number of referrals beyond 80 days (Excluding 1, 4 and 8)	Number of referrals within timeline	Percent Compliance (Target 100%)	Target (100%) Met/Not Met
Barbour	104	1	103	99.04%	Not Met
Berkeley	853		853	100.00%	Met
Boone	155		155	100.00%	Met
Braxton	115	3	112	97.39%	Not Met
Brooke	60		60	100.00%	Met
Cabell	521	19	502	96.35%	Not Met
Calhoun	53	4	49	92.45%	Not Met
Clay	51		51	100.00%	Met
Doddridge	40		40	100.00%	Met
Fayette	257		257	100.00%	Met
Gilmer	41	2	39	95.12%	Not Met
Grant	55		55	100.00%	Met
Greenbrier	171		171	100.00%	Met
Hampshire	149	12	137	91.95%	Not Met
Hancock	190	1	189	99.47%	Not Met
Hardy	107		107	100.00%	met
Harrison	820	10	810	98.78%	Not Met
ODTP	0	0	0	0.00%	N/A
Jackson	167	2	165	98.80%	Not Met
Jefferson	293	21	272	92.83%	Not Met
Kanawha	1258	25	1233	98.01%	Not Met
Lewis	91	1	90	98.90%	Not Met
Lincoln	163	3	160	98.16%	Not Met
Logan	207		207	100.00%	met

Marion	404		404	100.00%	Met
Marshall	127		127	100.00%	Met
Mason	147		147	100.00%	Met
Mercer	476		476	100.00%	Met
Mineral	223	18	205	91.93%	Not Met
Mingo	114		114	100.00%	Met
Monongalia	469		469	100.00%	Met
Monroe	75		75	100.00%	Met
Morgan	71		71	100.00%	Met
McDowell	169		169	100.00%	Met
Nicholas	111	2	109	98.20%	Not Met
Ohio	209	1	208	99.52%	Not Met
Pendleton	63	1	62	98.41%	Not Met
Pleasants	39		39	100.00%	Met
Pocahontas	29	5	24	82.76%	Not Met
Preston	149	2	147	98.66%	Not Met
Putnam	434	3	431	99.31%	Not Met
Raleigh	547		547	100.00%	Met
Randolph	206		206	100.00%	Met
Ritchie	75		75	100.00%	Met
Roane	41	1	40	97.56%	Not Met
Summers	37		37	100.00%	Met
Taylor	119	2	117	98.32%	Not Met
Tucker	31		31	100.00%	Met
Tyler	56		56	100.00%	Met
Upshur	146		146	100.00%	Met
Wayne	373		373	100.00%	Met
Webster	43	1	42	97.67%	Not Met
Wetzel	80	2	78	97.50%	Not Met
Wirt	55	1	54	98.18%	Not Met
Wood	739	186	553	74.83%	Not Met
WVSDB	6		6	100.00%	Met
Wyoming	185	1	184	99.46%	Not Met
State	11969	330	11639	97.24%	Not Met

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 12: 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.

Referrals are families - contacted by the district upon notification by West Virginia Birth to Three provider - who consent to evaluation to determine eligibility for Part B public preschool special education services. All students referred and found to be eligible are required to have IEPs and services by their third birthday.

Target: The percentage of students exiting Part C and eligible for Part B services completing the eligibility process and receiving services by their third birthday will be maintained at 100%.

District Name	Percent Compliance	Target of 100% Met or Not Met
Barbour	100.00%	Met
Berkeley	100.00%	Met
Boone	100.00%	Met
Braxton	100.00%	Met
Brooke	100.00%	Met
Cabell	100.00%	Met
Calhoun	100.00%	Met
Clay	100.00%	Met
Doddridge	100.00%	Met
Fayette	100.00%	Met
Gilmer	100.00%	Met
Grant	100.00%	Met
Greenbrier	100.00%	Met
Hampshire	100.00%	Met
Hancock	100.00%	Met
Hardy	100.00%	Met
Harrison	100.00%	Met
ODTP	100.00%	Met
Jackson	100.00%	Met
Jefferson	100.00%	Met
Kanawha	100.00%	Met
Lewis	100.00%	Met
Lincoln	100.00%	Met
Logan	100.00%	Met
Marion	100.00%	Met
Marshall	100.00%	Met
Mason	100.00%	Met
Mercer	100.00%	Met

Mineral	100.00%	Met
Mingo	100.00%	Met
Monongalia	100.00%	Met
Monroe	100.00%	Met
Morgan	100.00%	Met
McDowell	100.00%	Met
Nicholas	100.00%	Met
Ohio	100.00%	Met
Pendleton	100.00%	Met
Pleasants	100.00%	Met
Pocahontas	100.00%	Met
Preston	100.00%	Met
Putnam	100.00%	Met
Raleigh	100.00%	Met
Randolph	100.00%	Met
Ritchie	100.00%	Met
Roane	100.00%	Met
Summers	100.00%	Met
Taylor	100.00%	Met
Tucker	100.00%	Met
Tyler	100.00%	Met
Upshur	100.00%	Met
Wayne	100.00%	Met
Webster	100.00%	Met
Wetzel	100.00%	Met
Wirt	100.00%	Met
Wood	100.00%	Met
WVSDB	100.00%	Met
Wyoming	100.00%	Met
State	100.00%	Met

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Target: 100% of IEPs for youth aged 16 and above meet all eight criteria of the effective transition measurement.

District Name	Total IEPs Reviewed	IEPs reviewed with each transition component marked as compliant	IEPs reviewed with one or more transition component out of compliance	Percent Compliant Target 100% Met or Exceeded
BARBOUR	10	10	0	Met
BERKELEY	20	17	3	Not Met (85.00%)
BOONE	10	10	0	Met
BRAXTON	10	10	0	Met
BROOKE	10	8	2	Not Met (80.00%)
CABELL	15	15	0	Met
CALHOUN	10	10	0	Met
CLAY	10	10	0	Met
DODDRIDGE	10	10	0	Met
FAYETTE	10	9	1	Not Met (90.00%)
GILMER	10	10	0	Met
GRANT	10	10	0	Met
GREENBRIER	10	10	0	Met
HAMPSHIRE	10	10	0	Met
HANCOCK	10	10	0	Met
HARDY	10	10	0	Met
HARRISON	15	15	0	Met
ODTP	10	10	0	Met
JACKSON	10	10	0	Met
JEFFERSON	10	3	7	Not Met (30.00%)
KANAWHA	20	20	0	Met
LEWIS	10	10	0	Met
LINCOLN	10	10	0	Met
LOGAN	10	10	0	Met
MARION	10	10	0	Met
MARSHALL	10	10	0	Met
MASON	10	10	0	Met
MERCER	10	10	0	Met
MINERAL	10	10	0	Met
MINGO	10	10	0	Met
MONONGALIA	10	10	0	Met
MONROE	10	10	0	Met
MORGAN	10	10	0	Met
MCDOWELL	10	10	0	Met
NICHOLAS	10	9	1	Not Met (90.00%)
OHIO	10	10	0	Met
PENDLETON	10	10	0	Met
PLEASANTS	10	10	0	Met
POCAHONTAS	10	10	0	Met
PRESTON	10	10	0	Met
PUTNAM	15	14	1	Not Met (90.00%)
RALEIGH	10	10	0	Met
RANDOLPH	10	10	0	Met
RITCHIE	10	10	0	Met
ROANE	10	10	0	Met
SUMMERS	10	10	0	Met
TAYLOR	10	10	0	Met
TUCKER	10	10	0	Met
TYLER	10	0	10	Not Met (0.00%)
UPSHUR	10	10	0	Met
WAYNE	10	10	0	Met
WEBSTER	10	10	0	Met
WETZEL	10	6	4	Not Met (60.00%)
WIRT	10	10	0	Met
WOOD	15	12	3	Not Met (80.00%)
WV Deaf & Blind	10	10	0	Met
WYOMING	10	10	0	Met
State	610	578	32	Not Met (94.75%)

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 14: Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school

A. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school was at 16.00% or more.

B. Number of respondent youth competitively employed within one year of leaving high school was at 50.00% or more.

C. Number of respondent youth 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 was at 65.00% or more.

To collect statewide and district-level data regarding effective transitions, the WVDE and the Office of Special Programs in coordination with District staff administered surveys to all students who had IEPs one year after these individuals exited secondary school. Inadequate return rates and large confidence intervals were exclusionary criteria for the determination process in the current year. The exclusionary criteria were implemented to obviate inaccurate conclusions at the local education agency level. Aggregate return rates were, however, sufficient to make a statewide determination on postsecondary outcomes.

District Name	Indicator 14A: 17% of respondents or greater enrolled in higher education (Yes/No)		Indicator 14B: 51.00% of respondents or greater enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year (Yes/No)		Indicator 14C: 66.00% of respondents or greater involved in higher education or competitively employed; or some other education or training or employment (Yes/No)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Barbour	No	7.69%	No	46.15%	No	61.54%
Berkeley	No	15.89%	Yes	65.42%	Yes	71.96%
Boone*	No	9.43%	Yes	60.38%	Yes	86.79%
Braxton	No	9.09%	Yes	63.64%	No	63.64%
Brooke	No	0.00%	No	0.00%	No	0.00%
Cabell	No	10.48%	No	28.57%	No	47.62%
Calhoun	No	0.00%	Yes	66.67%	Yes	66.67%
Clay	Yes	16.67%	No	33.33%	No	33.33%
Doddridge	No	5.56%	No	50.00%	No	61.11%
Fayette	No	5.71%	No	28.57%	No	37.14%
Gilmer	Yes	20.00%	Yes	60.00%	No	60.00%
Grant	No	15.38%	Yes	76.92%	Yes	92.31%
Greenbrier	Yes	50.00%	Yes	75.00%	Yes	75.00%
Hampshire	Yes	23.08%	No	30.77%	No	38.46%
Hancock	No	11.11%	Yes	61.11%	Yes	72.22%
Hardy	No	10.53%	Yes	68.42%	Yes	73.68%
Harrison	Yes	17.86%	Yes	53.57%	Yes	66.07%
ODTP	NA	0.00%	NA	0.00%	NA	N/A
Jackson	Yes	22.58%	Yes	64.52%	Yes	87.10%
Jefferson	No	0.00%	No	0.00%	No	0.00%
Kanawha	No	16.07%	No	44.64%	Yes	76.79%
Lewis	Yes	40.00%	Yes	80.00%	Yes	100.00%
Lincoln	Yes	38.46%	Yes	69.23%	Yes	69.23%
Logan	No	11.90%	No	35.71%	No	47.62%
Marion	No	12.50%	No	50.00%	Yes	75.00%
Marshall	Yes	31.71%	Yes	78.05%	Yes	95.12%
Mason	Yes	17.65%	Yes	64.71%	No	64.71%
Mercer	No	13.64%	Yes	63.64%	Yes	78.79%
Mineral	No	9.52%	Yes	66.67%	Yes	71.43%
Mingo	Yes	53.85%	Yes	76.92%	Yes	76.92%
Monongalia	No	11.11%	No	33.33%	No	55.56%
Monroe	Yes	22.22%	No	50.00%	Yes	72.22%

Morgan	Yes	16.67%	No	33.33%	Yes	66.67%
McDowell	No	5.88%	No	44.12%	No	44.12%
Nicholas	No	15.94%	No	27.54%	No	33.33%
Ohio	Yes	25.00%	No	37.50%	Yes	87.50%
Pendleton	No	15.38%	Yes	53.85%	No	61.54%
Pleasants	Yes	50.00%	Yes	83.33%	Yes	83.33%
Pocahontas	No	9.09%	Yes	81.82%	Yes	81.82%
Preston	Yes	17.14%	Yes	65.71%	Yes	71.43%
Putnam	Yes	29.41%	Yes	60.29%	Yes	67.65%
Raleigh	Yes	21.79%	Yes	60.26%	Yes	75.64%
Randolph	No	7.69%	Yes	76.92%	Yes	84.62%
Ritchie	No	14.29%	No	42.86%	No	64.29%
Roane	No	10.53%	No	31.58%	No	63.16%
Summers	No	7.69%	No	15.38%	Yes	76.92%
Taylor	No	0.00%	Yes	63.64%	Yes	81.82%
Tucker	No	42.86%	Yes	57.14%	Yes	71.43%
Tyler	No	31.58%	Yes	57.89%	Yes	73.68%
Upshur	No	14.29%	Yes	52.38%	No	57.14%
Wayne	Yes	22.00%	No	46.00%	No	60.00%
Webster	Yes	17.07%	No	0.00%	No	0.00%
Wetzel	No	15.38%	Yes	56.10%	No	63.41%
Wirt	Yes	25.00%	No	50.00%	No	50.00%
Wood	No	6.25%	No	27.08%	No	37.50%
WVSDB	No	0.00%	No	0.00%	No	N/A
Wyoming	Yes	23.68%	No	42.11%	No	63.16%
State	Yes	16.78%	Yes	51.44%	No	65.34%

Annual Performance Results and Targets for 2015-16

Indicator 15: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

Target: 75% of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements.

Indicator 16: Percent of mediation held that resulted in mediation agreements.

Target: 75% of mediations held complaints whether or not related to due process complaints.

REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART B, OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT	
Reporting Year:	2015-2016
SECTION A: Written, Signed Complaints	
(1) Total number of written, signed complaints filed	25
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	11
(a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	8
(b) Reports within timeline	11
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	14
SECTION B: Mediation Requests	
(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes	11
(2.1) Mediations held	10
(a) Mediations held related to due process complaints	3
(i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	3
(b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints	7
(i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	6
(2.2) Mediations pending	0
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held	1
SECTION C: Due Process Complaints	
(3) Total number of due process complaints filed	13
(3.1) Resolution meetings	6
(a) Written Settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings	6
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated	0

(a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited)	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	0
(3.3) Due process complaints pending	1
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing)	12
SECTION D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)	
(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed	1
(4.1) Resolution meetings	0
(a) Written settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed	1
Indicator 15:	
Number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6
Number of resolution sessions	6
Target 75%:	100% Met
Indicator 16:	
Total number of mediations agreements	9
Mediations held	10
Target 75%:	90% Met