

Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process: Self Review Report

Date of Report: May 2007

District Name: Lake Superior School District

District Number: 381

Cooperative/Education District Name: Northern Lights Special Education Cooperative

Director of Special Education: Linda Forsberg

Superintendent: Phil Minkkinen

Annual Due Date: June 30

Electronic Report Submission: mde.mncimp-sr@state.mn.us . Reports must be PC Microsoft Word© compatible
or

Send Report to: Bonnie Carlson, Compliance Supervisor
Minnesota Department of Education
Division of Compliance and Assistance
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113-4266

* For districts providing record review data:

Submit individual student non-compliance information electronically or on a CD. Please do not send a hard copy.

REPORT INFORMATION

Directions/Questions:

- The report includes brief directions for each reporting section. The MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual, which has more detailed directions, resources, and samples for several report sections can be found on the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) web site:
http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Accountability_Programs/Compliance_and_Assistance/Special_Education_Monitoring/MNCIMP_SR/index.html
- Questions pertaining to the due process/compliance components of the report may be directed to the district's lead compliance monitor.
- Most sections of the report require a district unit of analysis. Reporting directions for each section will indicate if a district within a cooperative or education district can report on an area using a cooperative unit of analysis.
- Caution is advised when attempting to analyze data based on small sample sizes, i.e. program evaluation, record review, and stakeholder data.

Report Format:

- It is not necessary to completely fill each space; and if more space is needed, the space provided will expand accordingly.
- Do not edit or delete any part of the report format. If the district is not required to report information in a particular section, leave the section blank.
- Include the district name and number, and cooperative/education district name, if applicable on the cover page. Also include the district name in the report footer, beginning on page three. To do this, go to the "View" button on the toolbar, click on "Header and Footer", then scroll to the bottom of the page to enter the district name. Click anywhere outside the footer to close.
- If using an acronym within the report, spell out the words completely first, with the acronym preceding it, e.g. Minnesota Department of Education (MDE).
- Do not include charts, appendices, or any attachments with this report.
- If possible, submit the report electronically to the email address on the cover page of the report. If electronic submission is not possible, mail two copies of the report to the address on the cover page of the report.
- Email the report by June 30 each year to mde.mncimp-sr@state.mn.us . All reports must be PC Microsoft Word© compatible.

1. District Demographics Directions

- Update the district demographic charts annually.
- Cooperatives: report each district's demographics and general information/significant trends or changes individually. Indicate the district name for each profile reported.

SPP/APR Part B Indicators 9&10

Total Student Enrollment (General Education plus Special Education) 1,648	Percentage of Total Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity (General Education plus Special Education) White - 97% Am. Indian – 1% Black – 1% Hispanic – 1%	Total Part B Special Education Enrollment (K-21) 223	Percentage of Part B (K-21) Special Education Minority Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity White - 94% Am. Indian – 2% Black – 4% Hispanic - <1%	Total Early Childhood Special Education Enrollment (Part C and Pre-K) 24
--	--	---	---	---

Our district has a foster home that serves 11 black students, all of which receive special education services and account for almost our entire black population. This is why our special education minority population is slightly above the state figure.

MNCIMP: SR Profile

- Starting with the first year of planning, indicate the number of years the district/cooperative has participated in Self-Review.
- If assistance is needed, contact your district's lead compliance specialist.
- Update this section annually.
- For cooperatives or education districts, report each member district's information individually as appropriate.
- Report any extenuating circumstances that impact the district demographics or disability demographics, i.e. open-enrolled student population, opening of a new group home in the district, etc.

Number of Years in Self-Review:	Date of last MDE Validation:	Date of next MDE Validation:
6	March 2004	2008-2009

2. District General Information and Significant Trends or Changes

District Background Data:

Lake Superior School district is located on the beautiful shores of Lake Superior. Geographically it is Minnesota's second largest school district encompassing 2600 square miles which includes all of Lake County and the southeastern tip of St. Louis County. William Kelley High School and William Kelley Elementary are co-located in one building in Silver Bay. Two Harbors hosts a new high school completed in 2005 for grades 6-12 and the Minnehaha Elementary which is an E-5 building. The district maintains a close relationship with North Shore Community E-6 Charter School. The population is 13,419 with 1650 students K-12.

LSSD is a member of the Northern Lights Special Education Cooperative (NLSEC). LSSD is composed of lower-moderate income residents, with 25 % of students eligible for free or reduced lunch.

The statistical significance of much of the CIMP Plan data needs to be interpreted with caution due to our district being very small, with only 14 full-time special education teachers divided between 3 schools.

Up until this year (2005) trends over the prior four years show that LSSD special education students were passing the BST and MCA's at the state rate or better.

Our existing Action Plan #1 has been changed to reflect our updated needs and the more recent MDE requirements in the Part C area of compliance. All strategies were completed. However, the continuing needs have been folded into a new Part C future year Action Plan.

MNCIMP: SR Membership Selection Process

There are two levels of Leadership Teams in our Cooperative MNCIMP framework. The Cooperative MNCIMP Leadership Team is described here. Each individual district also has a MNCIMP Leadership team which is described following this information.

The Northern Lights Special Education Cooperative (NLSEC) MNCIMP Leadership Team members were chosen to represent the wide geographic, economic and cultural variables of our twelve member districts. Members chosen were those willing to offer opinions and best represent their individual districts. It was important to include membership from a variety of perspectives, including general and special education staff, school administrators, parents and the advocacy community.

Membership responsibility: To review and revise the cooperative mission statement, belief statements and goal statements as well as giving individual districts direction in the implementation of MNCIMP.

Cooperative Leadership Team Formation and Membership

Team Member Name	District Position	Membership Length	Membership Responsibility
Joan Bloemendall-Gruett	K-12 Principal ISD #95	5 years	See above description
Scott Hoch	Superintendent ISD #93	5 years	See above description
Dan O'Hara	School Psychologist #004, #93	5 years	See above description
Jim Schwartzbauer	General Ed Teacher #700	5 years	See above description
Brenda Johnson	Speech/Language Clinician #93	5 years	See above description
Steve Schoenbauer	Transition Coordinator NLSEC	5 years	See above description
Russ Davidson	General Ed Math Teacher #99	5 years	See above description
Michelle Sweeney	SLD Teacher #99	5 years	See above description
Heidi Hohnstadt	Speech/Language Clinician #700	5 years	See above description
Jean Brandt	School Psychologist # 381	5 years	See above description
Stephanie Bahen	School Psychologist #94	5 years	See above description
Sallie Gotelaere	Special Ed Coordinator NLSEC	5 years	See above description
Linda Forsberg	Special Ed Director NLSEC	5 years	See above description
Melissa Gamst	SLD Teacher #97	5 years	See above description
Lois Backsheider	High School Principal #700	5 years	See above description
John Larson	Elementary Principal #709	5 years	See above description
Bambi Neumann	E/BD Teacher #577	5 years	See above description
Sue Zmyslony	Special Ed Coordinator NLSEC	5 years	See above description
Jenny Bouchie	ECSE Teacher #94	5 years	See above description
Cathy Quale	ECSE Teacher #004	5 years	See above description
Kay Stevens	ECSE Teacher Fond du Lac Head Start	5 years	See above description
Larry Johnson	School Psychologist #91, #97	5 years	See above description
Amy Tokvam	SLD Teacher #381	5 years	See above description
Bonnie Charis	School Psychologist #704	5 years	See above description
Kris Cameron	Elementary Teacher #94	5 years	See above description
Jan Lippit	School Psychologist #577	5 years	See above description
Marilyn Nelson	ECSE Coordinator/Child Find NLSEC	5 years	See above description

Connie Roy	Parent #94	5 years	See above description
Carolyn King	Parent #700	5 years	See above description
Angela DeWitt	Parent #004	5 years	See above description
Tina Olson	DCD Teacher #704	years	See above description
Patrick Jardine	School Psychologist #700	5 years	See above description
Lisa Jacobson	School Psychologist #99, #95, #100	5 years	See above description

3. MNCIMP:SR Membership Selection Process

MNCIMP Leadership Team members were chosen to represent the wide geographic, economic and cultural variables of our district. Members chosen were those willing to offer opinions and best represent the district. It was important to include membership from a variety of perspectives, including paraprofessionals, general and special education staff, school administrators, and parents.

Membership responsibility: To review and revise the CIMP planning goals annually, analyze data collected, and give direction in the implementation of MNCIMP.

Team Member Name	District Position	Term Length	Membership Responsibility
Michelle Ronning	Parent	3 years	See above description
Kim Pierson	DAPE teacher	3 years	See above description
Caren Nelson	Elementary teacher	3 years	See above description
Jean Brandt	School Psychologist	Unlimited	See above description
Casey Ellsworth	Special education teacher	4 years	See above description
Jenna Udenberg	Secondary education teacher	4 years	See above description
Christina Mattson	Special education teacher	4 years	See above description
Lynda Norlen	Paraprofessional	5 years	See above description
Karen Lodin	Regular education teacher	5 years	See above description
Pat Driscoll	Administrator	5 years	See above description

4. MNCIMP:SR Parental & Community Involvement

How are parents and community involved in the MNCIMP:SR planning process, analysis of the data, and Action Planning process?

There are LSSD parents on the Cooperative-wide Minnesota Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Plan (MnCimp) Leadership Team. In addition, we have two parents who actively attended our yearly meetings, in which they assisted in analyzing data, provided input into the development of Action Plans, and shared results at district Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings. The community was invited, via our district "Good News Bulletin" and outside agency SAT meetings, to participate in our end of the year MNCimp planning meeting and four community members participated.

MNCIMP:SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable): Northern Lights Special Education Cooperative

4. MNCIMP:SR Parental & Community Involvement

How is your district's MNCIMP:SR status and progress disseminated to parents, community, and other stakeholder groups?

The MNCIMP: SR is disseminated to parents, community, and stakeholders by results summarized in the District "Good News Bulletin", which is mailed to all families in the school district, three times a year. The entire Plan is also on the school district website and is shared with and discussed at a fall school board meeting. The school psychologist presented, at two parent teacher conferences, ideas of how parents can assist their children in being more successful at school. The school website was reviewed and how to access various learning links. The CIMP Plan was reviewed, as well as, how to access it on the site. About 30 – 40 parents of special education students attended the presentations.

5. Special Education Mission and Belief Statements

Mission Statement: Together schools and communities will educate students to become academically successful and socially responsible citizens.

- Belief Statements:**
1. All students will have access to a continuum of effective specialized instructional services within the school and community.
 2. All students will receive individually designed instruction based upon the student's learning style, strengths, interests and needs.
 3. All students with special needs are full members of the larger educational community.
 4. All school personnel and parents need to have knowledge of current information regarding special education requirements.

Have you changed the mission and belief statements from your previous report? YES NO X

If yes, provide rationale for the change.

Special Education Goal Statements

Describe the process for development of the goal statements: Goal statements were developed at the same time and using the same process as the mission and belief statements. The NLSEC Leadership Team was convened on March 8, 2004 at Blackwood's Conference Center in Proctor Minnesota. The group's charge was to revise the Mission Statement, Belief Statements and Goal Statements, which were originally developed during the 1998-99 school year. A facilitator was hired to assist in the process. The leadership team worked in small groups to propose changes to each statement, which were in turn, was brought to the larger group. Each member was allowed to vote in order to prioritize and reach agreement on changes to the statements. The entire group came to consensus on each proposed change. As in the past, the Cooperative Leadership Team recommended that individual districts adopt the Mission Statement, Belief Statements and Goal Statements as developed

Goal Statements:

Northern Lights Special Education COOP Goals:

1. Students will demonstrate measurable progress in the development of skills needed in a variety of environments.
2. Individual learners will demonstrate a positive social, physical and emotional self-awareness.
3. By graduation, individual learners will demonstrate the ability to make successful school to adult transitions.
4. Schools and communities will ensure compliance with due process procedures of IDEA so as to ensure student growth.

LSSD annual Goals:

1. Students will demonstrate measurable progress in Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Reading and Math
2. Children younger than three, in need of special services, will be identified through Child Find activities.

Have you changed the goal statements from your previous report?

YES NO

If yes, provide rationale for the change. Lake Superior School District has developed an annual goal in order to address specific areas in need of improvement.

6. Program Evaluation Directions: Student Achievement

- Report and provide an analysis for any grade and subject in which the district did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress (AYP) for the special education population. Small districts of similar size within a cooperative or education district may be grouped for reporting purposes.
- Select the **degree of need** (high, medium or low) based upon the urgency to implement change as determined by district criteria established by the leadership team. For each area designated as a high need, linkage with the District’s Improvement Plan under NCLB for the following school year must be provided (see Future Action Plan section of this report).

SPP/APR Part B Indicator 3

Did your district make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the entire special education subgroup in 2005-2006? (See district report card.)

Yes _____

No X

NA (cell size too small to calculate AYP for Special Education) _____

If your district missed AYP last year for the first time, it is possible that next year your district will officially be in “needs improvement” status. How do you plan to improve the proficiency levels of students with disabilities? Respond below.

(See “District Data Profile” online at <http://education.state.mn.us/mde/> for information needed to complete this section)

Grade Level (enter rate)	Skill Assessed (check)	Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
3 <u>89.5</u> 4 <u>35.3</u> 5 <u>53.3</u> 6 <u>55.6</u> 7 <u>10.5</u> 8 <u>25.0</u> 11 <u>11.1</u>	Math <u> X </u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any extenuating circumstances? • How are you linking into your district’s Improvement Plan under NCLB? • Are there additional steps you plan to take? If yes, document details in the Future Action Plan in this report. <p>Although our cell sizes are small, we did have lower proficiency rates than the state in several grade levels. This past year our district had several staff development trainings for improving Reading instruction. We also are implementing NWEA MAP testing for grades K through 6 and all special education students. We will be using these results to program early interventions for the primary level students. We will be using the results as a means of measuring improvement over time. This fall our district will be having an all day RTI in-service for all teachers. Our goals are to begin implementing RTI within the next two years. Our district also started offering all-day every-day kindergarten this past year in the hopes it will improve students academic skills.</p>	High <u> X </u> Medium _____ Low _____

MNCIMP:SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable): Northern Lights Special Education Cooperative

Grade Level (enter rate)	Skill Assessed (check)	Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
3 __ 78.9 __ 4 __ 23.5 __ 5 __ 66.7 __ 6 __ 61.1 __ 7 __ 57.9 __ 8 __ 54.2 __ 10 __ 47.1 __	Reading <u>X</u> __	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any extenuating circumstances? • How are you linking into your district's Improvement Plan under NCLB? • Are there additional steps you plan to take? If yes, document details in the Future Action Plan in this report. See above. 	High <u>X</u> __ Medium ____ Low ____

Program Evaluation Directions: High School Graduation, Dropout & Suspensions/Expulsions

- **Report and provide analysis for any performance areas where the district performance falls below the state and/or rates.** Small districts of similar size within a cooperative or education district may be grouped for reporting purposes.
- Select the **degree of need** (high, medium or low) based upon the urgency to implement change as determined by district criteria established by the leadership team. Each area designated as a high need must have a corresponding Action Plan for the following school year (see Future Action Plan section of this report).

Reporting Categories	SPP/APR Indicator	2005-2006 State Data	Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
Graduation Rates	Part B 1	State Rate = 82.43% State Target = 81.95% (Special Education Rate)	District Rate <u>86.4</u> At or below state rate? Yes ____ No <u>X</u> At or below state target? Yes ____ No <u>X</u> If below either state target or rate, provide an analysis.	High ____ Medium ____ Low <u>X</u>
Dropout Rates	Part B 2	State Rate = 4.89%	District Rate <u>3.8</u> At or above state rate? Yes ____ No <u>X</u> At or above state target? Yes ____ No <u>X</u>	High ____ Medium ____

Program Evaluation Directions: High School Graduation, Dropout & Suspensions/Expulsions

		State Target = 4.55% (Special Education Rate)	If above either state target or rate, provide an analysis.	Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Suspension and Expulsion Rates >10 days	Part B 4	State Rate = 1.25% State Target = 1.8% (Special Education Rate)	District Rate <u>1.3</u> At or above state rate? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> At or above state target? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If above either state target or rate, provide an analysis. The number of students that account for this rate is small for making a valid analysis. The rate would be less than the state rate if only ONE student had not been suspended or expelled.	High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Program Evaluation Directions: Child Find & Least Restrictive Environment

- Report and **provide analysis for any performance areas where the district falls below the state target and/or state rate**. Small districts of similar size within a cooperative or education district may be grouped for reporting purposes. Please note that this data is provided at the administrative unit level in Part C sections.
- Data can be found on the MDE website at http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Learning_Support/Special_Education/Statewide_Performance/State_Local_Outcome_Data/index.html
- Select the **degree of need** (high, medium or low) based upon the urgency to implement change as determined by district criteria established by the leadership team. Each area designated as a high need must have a corresponding Action Plan for the following school year (see Future Action Plan section of this report).

Reporting Category	SPP/APR Indicator	2005-2006 State Data	Program Evaluation Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
Part C: Child Find Birth-1	Part C 5	State Rate = .46% State Target = .45%	District Rate <u>0%</u> At or above state rate? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At or above state target? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If below either state target or rate, provide an analysis. This sample is small for drawing valid conclusions. However, we will be implementing an Action Plan in order to improve Child Find in this area.	High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/>
Part C: Child Find	Part C 6	State Rate = 1.57%	District Rate <u>.59%</u> At or above state rate? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	High <input type="checkbox"/>

Reporting Category	SPP/APR Indicator	2005-2006 State Data	Program Evaluation Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
Birth-2		State Target = 1.56%	At or above state target? Yes ___ No <u>X</u> If below either state target or rate, provide an analysis. We only have two children identified in this area. Given our district size, we would need 3 children to meet this criteria. Thus, one more student and we would have met it. This sample is small for drawing valid conclusions. However, we will be implementing an Action Plan in order to improve Child Find in this area.	Medium <u>X</u> Low ___
Part C: Natural Environment (ages 0-3)	Part C 2	State Rate = 90.3% State Target = 89.5%	Administrative Unit Rate <u>100%</u> At or above state rate? Yes <u>X</u> No ___ At or above state target? Yes <u>X</u> No ___ If below either state target or rate, provide an analysis.	High ___ Medium ___ Low <u>X</u>
Part B: Pre-School Settings LRE (age 3-5) environments with typically developing peers (including settings 1, 3, & 4)	Part B 6	State Rate = 50.5% State Target = 58%	Administrative Unit Rate <u>84.8%</u> At or below state rate? Yes ___ No <u>X</u> At or below state target? Yes ___ No <u>X</u> If below either state target or rate, provide an analysis.	High ___ Medium ___ Low <u>X</u>

Reporting Category	SPP/APR Indicator #	2005-2006 State Data	Program Evaluation Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
Part B: Settings/LRE School Age (6-21) Removed from class less than 21% of day	Part B 5A	State Rate= 60.40% State Target Rate = 61%	District Rate <u>63.7%</u> At or below state rate? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At or below state target? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If below either state target or rate, provide an analysis.	High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part B: Settings/LRE School Age (6-21) Removed from class greater than 60% of the day	Part B 5B	State Rate=9.94% State Target Rate = 9.55%	District Rate <u>4.9%</u> At or above state rate? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At or above state target? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If above either state target or rate, provide an analysis.	High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part B: Settings/LRE School Age (6-21) Served in separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements	Part B 5C	State Rate= 4.74% State Target Rate = 5.4%	District Rate <u>.9%</u> At or above state rate? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At or above state target? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If above either state target or rate, provide an analysis.	High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Program Evaluation Directions: Early Childhood Outcome Data

- Report and **provide analysis for any performance areas where the district falls below the state target.** Small districts of similar size within a cooperative or education district may be grouped for reporting purposes.
- Data can be found on the MDE website at http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Learning_Support/Special_Education/Statewide_Performance/State_Local_Outcome_Data/index.html
- Select the **degree of need** (high, medium or low) based upon the urgency to implement change as determined by district criteria established by the leadership team. Each area designated as a high need must have a corresponding Action Plan for the following school year (see Future Action Plan section of this report).

Program Evaluation Directions: Early Childhood Outcome Data

Reporting Category	SPP/APR Indicator	2005-2006 State Data	Program Evaluation Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
<p>Parts B and C: Transition</p> <p>A. Documentation of transition planning on IFSP B. Transition conferences occurred during regulatory timeframe</p>	<p>Part B #</p> <p>Part C</p> <p>8</p>	<p>State Targets =</p> <p>A. 100% compliance</p> <p>B. 100% compliance</p>	<p>A. IFSP documentation of transition planning – Administrative Unit Rate <u>33.3%</u> At state target of 100%? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If not at the state target, provide an analysis. Formal transitional conferences were held but not documented. The Coop has now developed a Part C/Early Childhood Special Education Tracking Form to document these meetings. We will be implementing an Action Plan in order to improve in this area.</p> <p>B. Transition conferences occurred – Administrative Unit Rate <u>0%</u> At state target of 100%? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If not at the state target, provide an analysis. Formal transitional conferences were held but not documented. The Coop has now developed a Part C/Early Childhood Special Education Tracking Form to document these meetings. We will be implementing an Action Plan in order to improve in this area.</p>	<p>High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Medium <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Low <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Part C: Timely Evaluations</p> <p>45-day timeline</p>	<p>Part C</p> <p>7</p>	<p>State Target =</p> <p>100% compliance</p>	<p>Administrative Unit Rate <u>86.7%</u> At state target of 100%? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If not at the state target, provide an analysis. At this point we are not speculating as to why this is low. We are now collecting data for future analysis. We will be implementing an Action Plan in order to improve in this area.</p>	<p>High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Medium <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Low <input type="checkbox"/></p>

7. Stakeholder Information Directions

- Data collection efforts must either include all members of a stakeholder group or a representative sample of the group.
- The representative sample must provide a valid sample size to be able to generalize the data.
- A tool to use to determine an appropriate sample size can be found at: <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>.
- Indicate the format used to collect stakeholder data.
- Report the sampling method(s) used, as part of the analysis.
- Disaggregate all Part B and Part C responses and report separately.
- Include the number of stakeholders identified for the initial contact.
- Include the number of stakeholders that participated.
- Include the number of participants necessary for a valid sample.
- Summarize findings for each stakeholder group.

FAMILY SURVEY: QUESTION 8 Include the following data specific to question 8 on the MDE survey:

- Report Part B data only.
- Record the number of families that responded to question 8.
- Provide the number of families that responded for each rating 1 through 5, e.g. 2 marked 1; 0 marked 2; 7 marked 3; 75 marked 4; 250 marked 5.
- Select the **degree of need** (high, medium or low) to implement change as determined by district criteria established by the leadership team.
- Each area designated as a high need must include a corresponding Action Plan for the following school year. (See Future Action Plan.)

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Findings	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need (check one)
Family Part C	Information was collected through <input type="checkbox"/> <u>MDE Survey</u> <input type="checkbox"/> District Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group(s) Sampling method: Part C: <u>Survey</u> or <u>Focus Group</u> # surveys distributed = <u>2</u> # of families contacted _____ # surveys returned = <u>2</u> # of families participated _____ # for valid sample = <u>2</u>	2006/07	High ____ Medium ____ Low <u>X</u>
Family Part C	Findings: Both parents were very satisfied with all areas of special education services. Again, this is a very small sample size to draw conclusions upon, but there are only two children serviced in our district under Part C		

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Findings	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need (check one)										
Family Part B	<p>Information was collected through <input type="checkbox"/> <u>MDE Survey</u> <input type="checkbox"/> District Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group(s)</p> <p>Sampling method:</p> <p>Part B <u>Survey</u> or <u>Focus Group</u> # surveys distributed = <u>232</u> # of families contacted _____ # surveys returned = <u>76</u> # of families participated _____ # for valid sample = <u>68</u></p> <p>SPP/APR Indicator #3 MDE Survey Question 8: # surveys returned with a response to question 8 = <u>76</u></p> <p>Number of responses for score</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr><td>_____</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>_____</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td><u>17</u></td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td><u>59</u></td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td><u>NA</u></td><td>5 was no #5</td></tr> </table>	_____	1	_____	2	<u>17</u>	3	<u>59</u>	4	<u>NA</u>	5 was no #5	2006/07	High ____ Medium ____ Low <u>X</u>
_____	1												
_____	2												
<u>17</u>	3												
<u>59</u>	4												
<u>NA</u>	5 was no #5												
Family Part B	<p>Findings: All items on the family surveys resulted in scores of 3.0 to 3.94 with 3 indicating agreement and 4 indicating strong agreement. Of all stakeholders consulted, families appear to be the most satisfied with special education services in our district. Comments noted on the surveys are as follows: “Would like smaller special ed. class sizes; Nice job building network between school and medical providers in the community; Everyone is doing a great job; I have had four children receiving special education services at one time or another and truly feel they have received great services.”</p>	2006/07											
General Educator Staff	<p>Information was collected through <input type="checkbox"/> <u>MDE Survey</u> <input type="checkbox"/> District Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group(s)</p> <p>Sampling method:</p> <p><u>Survey</u> or <u>Focus Group</u> # surveys distributed = <u>65</u> # of general education teachers contacted _____ # surveys returned = <u>57</u> # of general education teachers participated _____ # for valid sample = <u>39</u></p>	2006/07	High ____ Medium <u>X</u> Low ____										

General Educator Staff	Findings: All items on the general ed. teacher's surveys resulted in scores of 2.77 to 3.54 with 3 indicating agreement and 4 indicating strong agreement. We determined that areas scored with a mean score below 3 was to be taken as a concern. The following areas were noted of concern: Administrative support and services for special ed. students; sharing of assessment results and necessary information with all teachers with insight into student's educational needs; and having special ed. staff assist them with strategies for working with students with possible disabilities, not currently in special ed. Our team determined that we can address this issue by discussing it as a special education group and brainstorming ways of getting the information out to general ed. teachers on a more consistent basis.	2006/07	
Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Findings	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need (check one)
Paraprofessional	Information was collected through <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Survey <input type="checkbox"/> District Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group(s) Sampling method: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <u>Survey</u> # surveys distributed = <u>21</u> # surveys returned = <u>20</u> # for valid sample = <u>17</u> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> or <u>Focus Group</u> # of paraprofessionals contacted _____ # of paraprofessionals participated _____ </div> </div>	<u>2005/06</u>	High ____ Medium ____ Low <u>X</u>

<p>Paraprofessional</p>	<p>Findings: Our CIMP team determined that if 70% or more of the staff were in agreement with the survey questions that would be considered to be a positive response. Para's rated all questions as meeting this criteria. This is likely due to the previous trainings and interventions conducted in the previous two years. Para's needs have been an issue in the past.</p> <p>In addition to stakeholder surveys paraprofessionals completed a questionnaire, in 2004, which identified the following information:</p> <p>Two of twenty Para's indicated that they have not attended any Para trainings over the past couple of years. The trainings noted that they have attended recently addressed: Fetal Alcohol, bullying, autism, sign language, responsive classroom, first aid, reading, CPR, and blood born pathogens. Fourteen of the twenty indicated that they have had any training in dealing with student behaviors and all twenty indicated they would be interested in training addressing behavior management skills. Seventeen of the twenty indicated that they have been provided with adequate information regarding the disabilities of the students they work with. Para's indicated that they would like trainings offered in the following areas: behavior management, depression, anger issues, and child abuse signs. Thus, in the fall of 2005, PARAPROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT TRAINING was facilitated by the school psychologist and the school counselor. Twenty-four para's attended and all completed the evaluation. The respondents rated the following statements as the most positive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The workshop helped me understand how to better deal with students that have behavior issues, 2. I feel confident that I will be able to deal with a student who is experiencing behavior difficulties, 3. The workshop presenter's answered my questions and concerns that I had during the presentation <p>The comments concerning the most valuable thing they learned during the workshop: "Proper mandated reporting; There's no one way to fix things, all kids are different; Idea sharing and options; How to deescalate a student; How to remain calm and avoid struggles; Proximity and tone of voice; To be consistent; How not to corner a student, give options; How to depersonalize situations, Don't overreact and ask for help when needed."</p>		
<p>Special Education Staff Part C</p>	<p>Information was collected through <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Survey <input type="checkbox"/> District Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group(s)</p> <p>Sampling method:</p> <p><u>Part C: Survey</u> or <u>Focus Group</u> # surveys distributed = <u>4</u> # of special education staff contacted _____ # surveys returned = <u>4</u> # of special education staff participated _____ # for valid sample = <u>4</u></p>	<p>2005/06</p>	<p>High ____ Medium ____ Low __X__</p>
<p>Special Education Staff Part C</p>	<p>Findings: Our CIMP team determined that if 70% or more of the staff were in agreement with the survey questions that would be considered to be a positive response. All three Part C staff rated all questions as meeting this criteria.</p>		

Special Education Staff Part B	Information was collected through <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Survey <input type="checkbox"/> District Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group(s) Sampling method: <u>Part B: Survey</u> or <u>Focus Group</u> # surveys distributed = <u>16</u> # of special education staff contacted _____ # surveys returned = <u>16</u> # of special education staff participated _____ # for valid sample = <u>16</u>	<u>2005/06</u>	High ____ Medium ____ Low <u>X</u>
Special Education Staff Part B	Findings: Our CIMP team determined that if 70% or more of the staff were in agreement with the survey questions that would be considered to be a positive response. Thus addressed below will be the areas that resulted in less than 70% agreement. Respondents rated only two questions out of twenty-nine as not meeting this criteria. 35% believe that in IEP meetings, reasonable options for programming are limited because of lack of district resources. District resources have been limited and reduced over the past several years with class sizes and caseloads increasing over time. 57% of respondents indicated that they were not knowledgeable about the local Community Transition Interagency Committee (CTIC) efforts. This was due to the fact that, about three years ago, this committee had been combined with the Interagency Early Intervention Council (IEIC) and is referred to as the "NLSEC Interagency Council." This was for the purpose of fulfilling the goals of the CTIC in a much broader scope. This council is goal oriented, is very active, and addresses the needs of children birth through age twenty-one.		

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Findings	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need (check one)
Administrator (Optional)	Information was collected through <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Survey <input type="checkbox"/> District Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Focus Group(s) Sampling method: <u>Survey</u> or <u>Focus Group</u> # surveys distributed = <u>5</u> # of administrators contacted _____ # surveys returned = <u>5</u> # of administrators participated _____ # for valid sample = <u>5</u>		High ____ Medium ____ Low <u>X</u>
Administrator (Optional)	Findings: Administrator's rated several areas as unfavorable. Two felt that their special education staff does not receive the necessary training and in-service for working with special education students. Two felt that the collaboration between special ed. Staff and regular ed. Staff is not as effective as it could be. Three indicated that they were not aware of the districts (COOP) Parent Advisory Committee. They also noted that post-school follow-up information is not available on students who were in special education on an annual basis to make program decisions. Our district has participated in the post-school follow-up survey and this information was made available through our Coop. Very minimal information was received from graduated students thus, program decisions were not based on this information.		

Part B and Part C SPP/APR (all)

8. Record Review Directions

- Records selected for review must be a demographically representative sampling of a district's students in special education.
- The representative areas include but are not limited to disability, race/ethnicity, age and gender.
- The Part B record sample and the Part C record sample must be determined separately.
- A tool to use to determine an appropriate sample size can be found at: <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>.

- Report a summary of findings for each TSES area that has non-compliance identified in one or more student files.
- Include the total number of records identified with non-compliance and the total number of records reviewed, e.g. "5 of 10 secondary transition records lacked a secondary transition evaluation by age 14 or grade nine."
- Indicate if the records reviewed were Part C or Part B. The record review data must be reported separately.
- Under the "Compliance Status" column, check "individual student non-compliance" if one or more student records were identified.
- Check "MDE systemic non-compliance", if non-compliance is identified based on compliance findings from a variety of sources including but not limited to compliance review of individual student records, stakeholder survey responses and complaints identified within the monitoring cycle.

- **Each TSES area listed as "MDE non-compliance" must be included in the Action Plan.**
- **For each student file identified with non-compliance, submit the individual student information electronically using an Access Monitoring Database report by student and citation. If the report is not available, the information can be burned on a CD which can be sent to MDE.**
- **Do not send paper copies of the individual student data.**

Record Review Process and Sampling Procedures

TSES Reference Number	TSES Compliance Area	Part B	Part C	Record Review Data	Compliance Status
					<input type="checkbox"/> Individual Student Non-compliance <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Systemic Non-compliance
					<input type="checkbox"/> Individual Student Non-compliance <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Systemic Non-compliance
					<input type="checkbox"/> Individual Student Non-compliance <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Systemic Non-compliance
					<input type="checkbox"/> Individual Student Non-compliance <input type="checkbox"/> MDE Systemic Non-compliance

9. Longitudinal Review Directions (optional)

- Include the number of longitudinal records reviewed.
- Internal consistency reporting pertains to each indicator used to determine the consistency of documentation from initial or prior evaluation to the most current evaluation. Secondly, internal consistency addresses whether or not the three consecutive IEP were consistent with the IEP process. Address the quality indicators as strengths or weaknesses found in the review.
- Conferred benefit pertains to the data used to determine whether the student benefits from his/her special education program and service over time. Determine if growth was evident from evaluation to evaluation and across three consecutive IEP.
- Determine the **degree of need** (high, medium or low) based upon the urgency to implement change as determined by district criteria established by the leadership team. Each area designated as a high need must have a corresponding Action Plan for the following school year (See Future Action Plan section of this report).
- Refer to the 2004 MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual for additional directions, sampling procedures, and resources.

Reporting Categories	Longitudinal Review (optional) Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
Internal Consistency		High ____ Medium ____ Low ____
Conferred Benefit		High ____

Reporting Categories	Longitudinal Review (optional) Analysis	Degree of Need (check one)
		Medium ____ Low ____

10. Current Year Action Planning Directions

*Use the information reported in the district’s prior year Action Plan(s), reported as **high need** and/or **non-compliant**, to complete the following components, identified by an asterisk (*) in the left side of the chart below:

- ***Goal Statement:** Identify goal as stated in prior year’s MNCIMP:SR Report.
- ***Desired Outcome:** Provide a measurable statement of the expected outcome. “What will change as a result of strategies and activities implemented?”
- ***Strategy(s):** Describe strategies employed to achieve the desired outcome, e.g. training, staff development, policies, task force committees, etc.
- ***What collected data will give evidence of progress?** Describe what data will be collected to determine if the outcome has been met or if progress is being made.

For the current year’s report, complete the “Progress/Results Analysis” and “Status” sections of the chart below based on the prior year’s Action Plan(s) to determine if progress has been made in meeting the desired outcome.

- **Progress/Results Analysis:** Report data that was collected to determine whether the outcome was met.
- **Status:** Analyze results and determine progress from the prior year’s Action Plan(s) in meeting the desired outcome. Indicate whether the outcome was met, will need to be continued, or other. If the outcome was not met and will be continued, address the outcome in the next year’s Action Plan (see next page) and note any changes in strategies. If “Other” is checked, provide an explanation in the “Progress/Results Analysis” section.

Note: To insert additional lines to an Action Plan, tab after the last column and a new row will automatically be inserted. To insert additional Action Plan charts, insert a page break after the chart, then copy and paste the blank Action Plan chart into the new page.

Existing Action Plan(s) * Number 1					
*Goal Statement:		Students will demonstrate measurable progress in the development of skills needed in a variety of environments			
Complete this section using the Action Plans from the district’s existing MNCIMP:SR report from the prior year.			Complete this section for next year’s report.		
*Desired Outcome	*Strategies	*What collected data will give evidence of progress?	Progress/Results Analysis	Status	X
Our administrative unit will have 100% compliance in Part C TSES areas.	Implementation of Coop-wide clinics for evaluating Part C needs and ECSE workshops related to infants and toddlers birth to age two.	Compliance in Part C TSES areas will be determined through future district file review.	Strategies have all been completed. Even though this outcome as not been met, via data in Part C outcome data. It will be folded into a “Future Action Plan” Part C outcome as noted below.	Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	X
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
				Outcome Continue	

Existing Action Plan(s) * Number 1					
*Goal Statement:		Students will demonstrate measurable progress in the development of skills needed in a variety of environments			
Complete this section using the Action Plans from the district's existing MNCIMP:SR report from the prior year.			Complete this section for next year's report.		
*Desired Outcome	*Strategies	*What collected data will give evidence of progress?	Progress/Results Analysis	Status	X
	Improved interagency participation in the IIP process and improved administrator attendance at IIP meetings. Coop will consult with teacher whose file review indicated non-compliance.			Other: explain Outcome Continue Other: explain	

Existing Action Plan(s) * Number 2					
*Goal Statement:		Schools and communities will ensure compliance with due process procedures of IDEA so as to ensure student growth			
Complete this section using the Action Plans from the district's existing MNCIMP: SR report from the prior year.			Complete this section for next year's report.		
*Desired Outcome	*Strategies	*What collected data will give evidence of progress?	Progress/Results Analysis	Status	X
District will adequately address, when appropriate, the potential impact of our student's culture and native language on the results of their evaluations. Increased awareness of the importance of this outcome and instruction on how to improve in this area. (TSES 3.2.6)	Case Managers will be trained in the use of the disability area worksheets from the "Reducing Bias in Special Ed. Assessment" manual. MARSS data will be reviewed to determine minority status of students, prior to assessment plan development	The percentage of files that contain the minority status worksheets.	This year all assessments, reevaluation and initial, were monitored for documentation of TSES 3.2.6 and all files met this criteria, indicating improvement in this area. All strategies have been implemented and indicated improvement as well.	Outcome Met Outcome Continue Other: explain Outcome Continue Other: explain Outcome Continue Other: explain Outcome Continue Other: explain	X

11. Future Year Action Plan Directions (New Action Pan)

MNCIMP:SR	District Name:	23
Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable): Northern Lights Special Education Cooperative		

Complete the following components to address new areas identified in the current report as **high need** and /or as **non-compliant**:

- **Goal Statement:** Identify goal as stated on MNCIMP:SR Report.
- **Desired Outcome:** Provide a measurable statement of the expected outcome. “What will change as a result of strategies and activities implemented?”
- **Strategy(s):** Describe strategies employed to achieve the desired outcome. (E.g. training, staff development, policies, task force committees, etc.)
- **What collected data will give evidence of progress?** Describe what data will be collected to determine if the outcome has been met or if progress is being made.

The following sections should be left blank for the current report, and completed when submitting the MNCIMP:SR Report next year.

- **Progress/Results Analysis:** Report data that was collected to determine whether the outcome was met.
- **Status:** Analyze results and determine progress from the prior year’s Action Plan(s) in meeting the desired outcome. Indicate with an “X” whether the outcome was met, will need to be continued, or other. If the outcome was not met and will be continued, address the outcome in the next year’s Action Plan and note any changes in strategies. If “Other” is checked, provide an explanation in the “Progress/Results Analysis” section.

Note: To insert additional lines to an Action Plan, tab after the last column and a new row will automatically be inserted. To insert additional Action Plan charts, insert a page break after the chart, then copy and paste the blank Action Plan chart into the new page.

**Future Year Action Plan(s)
Number 1**

Goal Statement: Schools and communities will ensure compliance with due process procedures of IDEA so as to ensure student growth.

Complete this section using the Action Plans from the current report.			Complete this section prior to submitting next year's report.		
Desired Outcome	Strategies	What collected data will give evidence of progress?	Progress/Results Analysis	Status	X
Improvement of the documentation of transition planning and conferencing within regulatory timelines (SPP #8) will improve from 33% compliance to 100% compliance.	<p>Coop staff is collaborating with district MARSS coordinators to insure correct coding of Early Childhood data.</p> <p>State Part C Coordinator will train Part C staff on September 6th 2007, on process and documentation planning prior to age 3.</p>	Yearly District Report Card data will indicate 100% compliance in SPP Indicator 8.		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
Improve compliance of Part C 45 day evaluation timeline (SPP #7) from 86.7% to 100%.	<p>ECSE teams will participate in MARSS training.</p> <p>Child Find coordinator will train ECSE teachers to increase accurate and timely reporting to MARRS coordinators.</p> <p>Three ECSE workgroup meetings will be conducted to review and re-design models of infant and toddler evaluation services within Coop districts.</p> <p>Child Find coordinators will use newly developed tracking form to monitor 45 day timeline compliance.</p>	Yearly District Report Card data will indicate 100% compliance in SPP Indicator 7.		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	

Future Year Action Plan(s) Number 2					
Goal Statement:		Students will demonstrate measurable progress in Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Reading and Math			
Complete this section using the Action Plans from the current report.			Complete this section prior to submitting next year's report.		
Desired Outcome	Strategies	What collected data will give evidence of progress?	Progress/Results Analysis	Status	X
State AYP data will show that all grade levels, 3 through 11, will have made AYP for the special education subgroup.	<p>Teachers will be trained in the RTI process starting in the fall of 2007.</p> <p>Teachers will be trained in the use of scientifically researched based methods of teaching reading and math.</p> <p>Our district will continue to implement NWEA MAP testing 2 or 3 times a year and use the results to guide further interventions for special education students not meeting AYP.</p>	State AYP data, reported yearly, will indicate more grade levels making AYP than currently noted.		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	

Future Year Action Plan(s) Number 3					
Goal Statement:		Children younger than age three, in need of special services, will be identified through Child Find activities.			
Complete this section using the Action Plans from the current report.			Complete this section prior to submitting next year's report.		
Desired Outcome	Strategies	What collected data will give evidence of progress?	Progress/Results Analysis	Status	X
LSSD will increase the identification of children in need	The NLSEC created a Multi-agency Advisory Team in	Yearly District Report Card data will indicate SPP Indicator Part		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	

**Future Year Action Plan(s)
Number 3**

Goal Statement: Children younger than age three, in need of special services, will be identified through Child Find activities.

Complete this section using the Action Plans from the current report.

Complete this section prior to submitting next year's report.

Desired Outcome	Strategies	What collected data will give evidence of progress?	Progress/Results Analysis	Status	X
of special education services B-2, to meet the state requirement for our district population. This is SPP indicator Part C 5 and 6.	order to identify more children, Birth to 2, at risk for developmental delay. This team has sent resource kits to over 600 families of new borns in order to let parents know of our services. The NLSEC also created a website called "Look At Me Grow" which contains links to county and school resources, state and national organization, with downloadable parenting materials and a parent discussion board.	C 5 and 6 will be at the state rate or better.		Other: explain	
				Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	

12. Data Management Plan Directions

- District Data Profiles for Early Childhood and K-21 special education programs are published annually and can be found on the MDE website at http://education.state.mn.us/mde/Learning_Support/Special_Education/Statewide_Performance/State_Local_Outcome_Data/index.html
- The year prior to the district's scheduled MDE Validation Review, Part B and Part C record review findings should be included in the annual report.
- Prior to the district's scheduled MDE Validation Review, data must be gathered from all required stakeholder groups listed in the chart below. Districts may choose to collect data from one or more groups during each year of the MNCIMP:SR cycle, or collect data from all groups in one year.
- Complete the "Year Collected" column after the data has been collected for all categories except those already listed as "Annually".
- See the MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual for detailed sampling procedures and additional directions.

Data Sources and Targeted Population	Timing of Measurements	Year Collected
Part C: Child Find and Natural Environments	Annually	Annually – District results can be found in the Early Childhood District Data Profiles
Part C and Part B Early Childhood Outcome Data	Ongoing as children enter or exit Part C or Section 619	Annually – District results can be found in the Early Childhood District Data Profiles
Part C Family Outcomes Survey	Ongoing as children exit Part C	Annually—District results will be included in the Early Childhood District Data Profile
Part B (age 3-5): Settings/LRE	Annually	Annually – District results can be found in the Early Childhood District Data Profiles
Part B (age 6-21): Settings/LRE	Annually	Annually – District results can be found in the K-21 District Data Profiles
Part C: Timely Evaluations	Annually	Annually—District results can be found in the Early Childhood District Data Profile
MCA-2 Results (Grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 & 11) AYP Status for Special Education Subgroup	Annually	Annually – District results can be found in the K-21 District Data Profiles
Graduation Rates	Annually	Annually – District results can be found in the K-21 District Data Profiles
Dropout Rates	Annually	Annually – District results can be found in the K-21 District Data Profiles
Suspension and Expulsion Rates	Annually	Annually – District results can be found in the K-21 District Data Profiles
Family Stakeholder Information Part C	Maybe collected anytime in the cycle. Reported on the year prior to MDE Validation	2006/07
Family Stakeholder Information Part B	Maybe collected anytime in the cycle. Reported on the year prior to MDE Validation	2006/07

Data Sources and Targeted Population	Timing of Measurements	Year Collected
General Education Staff Stakeholder Information	May be collected any time in the cycle. Reported on the year prior to MDE Validation.	2006/07
Special Education Staff Stakeholder Information (Part C)	May be collected any time in the cycle. Reported on the year prior to MDE Validation.	2006/07
Special Education Staff Stakeholder Information (Part B)	May be collected any time in the cycle. Reported on the year prior to MDE Validation.	2005/06
Paraprofessional Stakeholder Information	May be collected any time in the cycle. Reported on the year prior to MDE Validation.	2005/06
Administrator Stakeholder Information (Optional)	May be collected any time in the cycle. Reported on the year prior to MDE Validation.	2005/06
Part B: Record Reviews Ages 3 to 21 Special Education Student	Conducted and reported on the year prior to MDE Validation	2007-2008
Part C: Record Reviews Birth to age 3 Early Childhood Infants and Toddlers	Conducted and reported on the year prior to MDE Validation	2007-2008