

# Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process: Self Review Report

Date of Report: June 30, 2005

District Name: Mounds View

District Number: 621

Cooperative/Education District Name:

Director of Special Education: Dan Hoverman

Superintendent: Dr. Jan Witthuhn

Annual Due Date: June 30

Electronic Report Submissions: [mde.mncimp-sr@state.mn.us](mailto:mde.mncimp-sr@state.mn.us) . All 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

## GENERAL REPORT DIRECTIONS

- The report includes directions for each reporting section. The 2004 MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual, which has more detailed directions, resources, and sample report sections can be found on the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) web site
- 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 versus an individual district reporting/unit of analysis.
- The space provided for each section is flexible for the amount of data the district needs to report. It is not necessary to completely fill the space, and if more space is needed, the space 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 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.
- Districts/Cooperatives who are in their first year of planning need only complete the following sections of this report:
  - District demographics
  - MNCIMP:SR Profile and General Information/Significant Trends or Changes
  - Leadership Team Formation and Membership Selection Process
  - MNCIMP:SR Parental and Community Involvement
  - Mission, Belief and Goal Statements
  - Data Management Plan
- Caution is advised when attempting to analyze data based on small sample sizes, i.e. program evaluation, record review, and stakeholder data.
- If using an acronym within the report, spell out the words completely first, with the acronym proceeding it, e.g. Minnesota Department of Education (MDE).
- Do not include charts, appendices, or any attachments with this report. Please staple the report and mail four copies by June 30 each year to the address indicated on the cover page of this report

## District Demographics Directions

- Update the district demographic charts annually.
- Include any general district information as well as significant trends or changes occurring.
- For Cooperatives, report each district's demographics and general information/significant trends or changes individually. Indicate the district name for each profile reported.

### District Demographics

Total Student Population	Total Minority Population	Total Part B Special Education Population	Total Part C Special Education Population	Total Part B Special Education Minority Population	Total Part C Special Education Minority Population	Total ECSE (age 3-5) Population
11,493 (6/21/05 includes all students, non-pub and out of district)	2,307 (6/21/05MARSS)	1273 (12/1/04)	28 (12/1/04)	251 (12/1/04)	8 (12/1/04)	140 (12/1/04)

### Disability Demographics

Disability Category:	SPL	DCD: MM	DCD: SP	PI	HI	VI	SLD	EBD	DB	OHD	ASD	DD	TBI	SMI
<b>Number of Special Education Students:</b>	209	89	27	13	21	3	347	189	0	156	137	101	4	5
<b>Disability Percentage:</b>	16.07	6.84	.23	.11	1.61	.23	26.67	14.53	0	11.99	10.53	7.76	.31	.38
<b>Number of Part B Students:</b>	209	89	27	13	17	3	347	189	0	156	136	78	4	5
<b>Number of ECSE (age 3-5) Students:</b>	40	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	25	63	0	0
<b>Number of Part C (age 0-3) Students:</b>	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	0	0

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

**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.
- 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.
- Report any changes to the data management plan from the prior year’s report.
- Refer to the 2004 MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual for reporting suggestions, resources and report examples.

<b>Number of Years in Self-Review:</b>	<b>Date of last MDE Validation:</b>	<b>Date of next MDE Validation:</b>
<b>Five years</b>	<b>December 7, 2001</b>	<b>06-07</b>

**District General Information and Significant Trends or Changes**

The Mounds View School district is located in the northern suburbs of Ramsey County. This includes all or part of the following communities: Arden Hills, New Brighton, Shoreview, Mounds View, North Oaks, Roseville and Vadnais Heights. After years of declining enrollment, the total public school enrollment increased slightly in the 2004-05 school year from 10,316 to 10,595 students. This does not include the enrollment of the districts four non-public schools that is approximately 1,271 students. The district is reported to be the 12<sup>th</sup> largest school district in the state.

District demographics, according to the 2003-04 data, show an average attendance rate of 94.2% and the average graduation rate for all high schools is 95.1%. Over 90% of Mounds View students are enrolled for the entire school year. Overall, 18.1% of our student receive free and reduced lunch. However there are pockets of higher poverty levels on the west side of the district resulting in four out of the eight elementary schools qualifying for Title I programs. Due to school closings and some elementary re-districting, four out the six elementary schools will qualify for Title I services in 2005-06.

10.9% of the students received special education services in the 2004-05 school year according to the Dec 1 child count. About 3% of the students received Title I services in the 2004-05 school year. 2.5% have limited English proficiency. Diversity in the district remains fairly constant with 19.2% of the students identified as minority (8 % as Asian, 6.8% as Black, 3.2% Hispanic and 1.2% as Native American.) Overall, the number of minority students receiving special education was consistent with the district representation at 19.8% students receiving special education.

While enrollment has increased slightly this past year, after years of declining enrollment, special education numbers have also increased slightly. There is evidence of shifts in the categories under which students are qualifying. In the past, the highest number of students receiving special education was SLD. While SLD continues to be the largest category of students identified, there was a decrease of over 2.5% on the percentage of SLD of the total special ed population from 29.2% to 26.67%. However, there was a significant increase in the percentage of students identified as ASD, an increase of 2.83%. The special education category of Other Health Impaired is another area where there has been an increase in the number of students identified compared to previous years (10.94% to 11.99% increase in special ed students with disabilities.)

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

### **District General Information and Significant Trends or Changes**

The two areas showing the most increase in student population, ASD and OHD, may be due to the increased awareness and identification of students suspected as being on the autism spectrum and better identification techniques. There is also a suspicion that many of the students identified as ASD and OHD, as well as all other categories, also have diagnosed mental health concerns, which may be contributing to teachers' reports of being overwhelmed. The students, regardless of their specific disability, seem to have more complex needs and often have secondary disabilities or additional mental health diagnoses.

There was a decrease in the percentage of students in special education identified as Developmental Delayed in the past year (9.17 % to 7.76% of the percentage of special education students.) There may be two reasons for the decline in students identified as DD. The first reason may be due to declining enrollment that is most evident at the younger ages in the district. The second reason may be the district's emphasis on completing more detailed evaluations resulting in better categorical determinations at a younger age.

The district will continue to use the DPRS system for meeting all due process requirements as well as for compiling reports. Since the 2004-05 school year was the first complete year using this system, we believe that we can do better tracking of student populations and due process monitoring.

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### MNCIMP:SR Membership Selection Process

The Mounds View School District has a leadership team that includes the following:

- Dan Hoverman, Deputy Supt and Special Education Director
- Barbara Nelson, Student Services Coordinator
- Ann Bettenburg, Student Services Coordinator
- Roger Thompson, Principal of Oak Grove and Career and Life Transition programs
- Kirk Diment, School Psychologist and CIMP Data Support

In addition to the District leadership team, there was a district advisory team including direct service staff and parents that was assigned the task as the MN CIMP:SR team. Additional team members were added so all levels and disabilities would be represented. Some of the members were also on the district file review teams.

#### Leadership Team Formation and Membership

Team Member Name	District Position	Membership Length	Membership Responsibility
<b>Barb Nelson</b>	<b>Student Services Coordinator</b>	<b>5 years</b>	<b>Leadership/Facilitation</b>
<b>Ann Bettenburg</b>	<b>Student Services Coordinator</b>	<b>2 years</b>	<b>Leadership/Facilitation</b>
<b>Kirk Diment</b>	<b>School Psychologist</b>	<b>5 years</b>	<b>Data Collection/Analysis</b>
<b>Brenda Foley</b>	<b>Special Education Teacher DCD</b>	<b>1 year</b>	<b>Representing DCD/High School</b>
<b>Debbie Wall</b>	<b>Special Education Teacher EBD</b>	<b>5 years</b>	<b>Representing EBD/Middle School</b>
<b>Jackie Diehl</b>	<b>Speech/Language Pathologist</b>	<b>1 year</b>	<b>Representing SP/Lang- All levels</b>
<b>Karen Mortenson</b>	<b>Setting 4 Elem. EBD Resource</b>	<b>3 years</b>	<b>Representing Elementary EBD</b>
<b>Karen Stauder</b>	<b>Special Education Teacher</b>	<b>3 years</b>	<b>Representing Elementary LD, DCD</b>
<b>Linda Eilers</b>	<b>Special Education Teacher DCD</b>	<b>3 years</b>	<b>Representing DCD/High School</b>
<b>Lynn Peal</b>	<b>District Autism Specialist</b>	<b>3 years</b>	<b>Representing Autism District Wide</b>
<b>Mary Jane Housch</b>	<b>Special Education MSMI/SMI</b>	<b>3 years</b>	<b>Representing MSMI/SMI Dist. Wide</b>
<b>Nancy Haugen</b>	<b>School Nurse</b>	<b>2 years</b>	<b>Representing Nursing Services</b>
<b>Peggy Cardenas</b>	<b>Social Worker</b>	<b>1 year</b>	<b>Representing Social workers</b>
<b>Rich Burke</b>	<b>DAPE Teacher</b>	<b>5 years</b>	<b>Representing Motor Team</b>
<b>Roger Thompson</b>	<b>Principal, Setting 4 MS/HS/Trans.</b>	<b>3 years</b>	<b>Representing Princ/Setting 4 Sites</b>
<b>Susan Hoch</b>	<b>Sp. Ed. / Work Exp/Transition</b>	<b>5 years</b>	<b>Representing Work Exp./Transition</b>
<b>Martha Efraimson</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>2 years</b>	<b>Representing Parents</b>
<b>Beth Davis</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>3 years</b>	<b>Representing Parents</b>
<b>Julie Blaske</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>1 year</b>	<b>Representing Parents</b>
<b>Mary Drabik</b>	<b>Parent</b>	<b>4 months</b>	<b>Representing Parents</b>

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### 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?

Four parents regularly attended the Advisory/ MN CIMP:SR (see above list.) These parents were equal members of the team when we reviewed and analyzed survey results, file review results and when drawing summary conclusions based on the findings. Parents were also helpful in affirming the District's mission and belief statements for the district and setting future direction and goals as part of the CIMP process.  
 In addition to having parents on the Leadership Team, parts of the report were shared with disability or program specific parent groups in order to gain further parental input and involvement.

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

The leadership team discussed the plan for dissemination and it was decided that the report would be shared primarily in two ways. The first will be at the large fall meeting of the Parent's Advisory group. The MNCIMP: SR Report will be posted on the districts web site used by more than 400 visitors a day.

### Special Education Mission and Belief Statements

Describe the process for development of the mission and belief statements:

The Leadership team reviewed the Mission and Belief statements from the previous year and affirmed the statements as being appropriate and relevant for the next year.

<b>Mission Statement:</b>	The mission of the Mounds View Schools, in partnership with students, parents and community, is to deliver a continuum of services to equip all learners with measurable skills for lifelong learning in order to reach their individual potential with responsibility to self and society.
---------------------------	---

<b>Belief Statements:</b>	We believe that all students can learn, have the right to learn, and must share in the responsibility for that learning. We believe that students have different learning styles, and that curriculum and instruction must address these differences. We believe that developing appropriate citizenship and communication skills are essential to successful transition from school to work. We believe that a quality program is the result of having a full continuum of services to meet the needs of each student. Decisions are student focused and based on individual needs through evaluation and team planning.
---------------------------	--

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

If yes, provide rationale for the change.

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

## Special Education Goal Statements

Describe the process for development of the goal statements:

After reviewing the data from the surveys and the file reviews, the Leadership Team identified the areas they recommended needed the most attention. These areas are marked as high need in the Program Evaluation section of this report. As a team, goal areas were identified, then specific outcomes and expectations were identified for each area and finally some activities that would address the goal were also discussed.

**Goal Statements:**

1. Continue to increase student achievement on the NWEA and Alternative Assessments based on data-driven decisions regarding effective instructional strategies.
2. Improve implementation of overall due process procedures documentation specifically in the areas of evaluation summary reports, non-discriminatory evaluations and compliance with timeline.
3. Improve communication regarding special education services and initiatives staff to staff and between staff and parents.
4. Continue to improve secondary transition programs and services through better alignment, organization and communication about district and community transition activities and resources.

Have you changed the goal statements from your previous report?

YES	X	NO	
-----	---	----	--

If yes, provide rationale for the change.

Based on new baseline information from 2005 file review and surveys it was determined by the CIMP Leadership Team that additional compliance and due process areas needed to be addressed in this plan. The achievement goal remains a constant emphasis in terms of continuing to provide staff development activities and increase use of effective intervention strategies for achievement in reading, writing and math

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

## Program Evaluation Directions

- Report BST and MCA test scores, dropout and graduation rates by providing a comparison among district, state and strata (comparing to districts of a similar size) data in this section annually. For cooperatives, indicate whether the data reported is cooperative data or individual district data. If using cooperative data, strata data comparison is required. Small districts of similar size within a cooperative or education district may be grouped for reporting purposes.
- Indicate the unit of analysis (district, cooperative, or grouping small districts of similar size within a cooperative) when reporting in each of the program evaluation areas.
- Indicate the number of students taking alternate assessments in each of the statewide testing categories.
- 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	Program Evaluation Data & Analysis					Degree of Need
State BST Test Scores Grade 8  Reading	School Year	District Data	State Data	Strata Data	% of Alternate Assessments	Low (because BST's will not be used in the future)
	03-04	38.7%	39.6%	Not Required	Not Required	
	Analysis: The district reading BST pass rate for special education students is similar to the reading BST pass rate for special education students from across the state. Both district and state pass rates are low compared to the reading BST pass rate for regular education students from across the state.					
State BST Test Scores Grade 8  Math	School Year	District Data	State Data	Strata Data	% of Alternate Assessments	Low (because BST's will not be used in the future)
	03-04	36.5%	28.4%	Not Required	Not Required	
	Analysis: The district math BST pass rate for special education students is similar to the math BST pass rate for special education students from across the state. Both district and state pass rates are low compared to the math BST pass rate for regular education students from across the state.					
State BST Test Scores Grade 10  Writing	School Year	District Data	State Data	Strata Data	% of Alternate Assessments	Low (because BST's will not be used in the future)
	03-04	86.5%	65.3%	Not Required	Not Required	
	Analysis: The district writing BST pass rate for special education students appears higher than the writing BST pass rate for special education students from across the state. The district special education pass rate is close to the writing BST pass rate for regular education students from across the state.					

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

Reporting Categories	Program Evaluation Data & Analysis					Degree of Need
	School Year	District Data	State Data	Strata Data	% of Alternate Assessments	
State MCA Test Scores Grade 3  Reading	03-04	42.2%	40.2%	43.6%	1.69%	Medium
	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA test is similar to the percentage of special education students from across the state, and from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in reading. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.					
State MCA Test Scores Grade 3  Math	03-04	53.3%	44.6%	48.4%	0.91%	Medium
	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA test is similar to the percentage of special education students from across the state, and from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in math. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.					
State MCA Test Scores Grade 5  Reading	03-04	57.5%	40.6%	47.8%	0.63%	Medium
	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA test appears to be higher than the percentage of special education students from across the state, and from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in reading. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.					
State MCA Test Scores Grade 5	03-04	50.5%	44.4%	52.0%	0.5%	Medium

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

Math	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA test is similar to the percentage of special education students from across the state, and from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in math. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.	
------	---	--

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

Reporting Categories	Program Evaluation Data & Analysis					Degree of Need
	School Year	District Data	State Data	Strata Data	% of Alternate Assessments	
State MCA Test Scores Grade 7 Reading						Medium
	03-04	38.8%	27.6%	33.6%	0.72%	
	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA test appears to be higher than the percentage of special education students from across the state, but similar to special education students from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in reading. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.					
State MCA Test Scores Grade 7 Math						Medium
	03-04	34.2%	25.2%	31.1%	0.72%	
	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA test appears to be higher than the percentage of special education students from across the state, but similar to special education students from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in math. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.					
State MCA Test Scores Grade 10 Reading						Medium
	03-04	58.8%	34.0%	40.2%	0.81%	
	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA test appears to be higher than the percentage of special education students from across the state, and from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in reading. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the reading MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.					
State MCA Test Scores Grade 11						Medium
	03-04	34.1%	24.0%	29.2%	0.89%	

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

Math	Analysis: The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA test appears to be higher than the percentage of special education students from across the state, but similar to special education students from the same strata, who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency in math. The percentage of special education students from Mounds View who scored at a 3 or higher level of proficiency on the math MCA is low compared to the percentage of regular education students, scoring at a 3 or higher level of proficiency, from across the state.	
------	---	--

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

Reporting Categories	Program Evaluation Data & Analysis			Degree of Need
Dropout Rates	District Data	State Data	Strata Data	Medium
	31 / 450 = 6.9%	4.6%	4.0%	
	Analysis: The dropout rate for Mounds View special education students appears to be slightly higher than the dropout rate for special education students from across the state and from within the same strata. The district needs to be further analysis of these data to better understand what intervention is necessary.			
Graduation Rates	District Data	State Data	Strata Data	Medium
	90 / 112 = 80.4%	81.9%	85.4%	
	Analysis: The graduation rate for Mounds View special education students appears to be similar to the graduation rate for special education students from across the state but lower than the graduation rate of special education students from within the same strata. District AYP data showed the percent as 81.4.			
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The NWEA Test is our local reading and math test for grades 2 – 8</li> <li>• In Reading: Students in special Ed. For whom we have a reading test score for in 2004-05 ( N 412) made 86% of normative growth with 46% of them making a year’s growth in one year’s time. Students whose IEP was terminated during the school year, made 105% of the normative growth and 69% of the 32 students made a year’s growth in reading. Special Ed. Students in grade 6 appears to have performed well compared to 2003-04, making 108% of normative growth and 53% of the students made a year’s growth. 12% more students showed growth in 6<sup>th</sup> grade.</li> <li>• In Math: Students enrolled in Special Ed. for whom we have a math test score made 78% of normative growth with 42% making a year’s growth in a year’s time. Students whose IEP was terminated made 132% of normative growth and 70% of the 33 students made a year’s growth in math. Grades 2 and 3 appear to be a relative strength with 121% of the students making normative growth and 63% of them showing growth in math. Grade 6 appears to continue to be an area of concern with only an increase of 3% more students making growth in 2004-05.</li> </ul>			Medium

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

### Stakeholder Information Directions

- Include sample sizes within stakeholder analysis section. If surveys are used, the number of surveys distributed and returned must be included in the analysis.
- Disaggregate Part B and Part C family and special education stakeholder group analysis.
- 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 include 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, program evaluation indicators, and examples.

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Analysis	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need
Family	<p>Part C:                      The family survey (provided by the state) was mailed to the families of the 24 children currently enrolled in the birth to two program. ). A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed with the survey. Out of the 24 surveys mailed, 6 were returned (25% return rate. Because of the small sample size, any interpretation should be viewed cautiously. Average ratings at or above 3 were viewed as being positive while ratings below 2.5 were viewed as being negative. In general, families of students in the birth to two program were satisfied with the special education services their children were receiving. The lowest average rating for all items was a 3.0 suggesting that families were generally positive across all categories (e.g., program accessibility, collaboration, etc.)</p>	2004-05	Low

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Analysis	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need
	<p>Part B:</p> <p>The family survey (provided by the state) was sent out to a stratified sample of families with children ages 3 to 21 receiving special education services. In total, 1,279 children were identified as receiving special education services and were sorted by school/program in alphabetical order. The family of every fourth child from each school/program was selected and sent a survey, resulting in 318 surveys (approximately 25% of total 3 to 21 special education population) being mailed. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed with the survey. Out of the 318 surveys mailed, 106 were returned (33% return rate). A phone interview was completed by an interpreter for families where English is not spoken.</p> <p>Average ratings at or above 3 were viewed as being positive while ratings below 2.5 were viewed as being negative. The three highest average ratings (3.4 to 3.7) pertained to 1) the parent/guardian feeling that their opinions about their child's needs were requested and considered in the decision-making when the IFSP, IEP, or IIIP was developed (Family Involvement), 2) the parent/guardian feeling that their child has equal access to the services, programs, and opportunities that are available to all children (Program Accessibility), and 3) the parent/guardian feeling that their child's building was physically accessible to him/her (Space Accessibility).</p> <p>The three lowest average ratings were at 2.4 to 2.6. which are in the borderline range of our Leadership Teams cutoff. These three areas are: 1) staff keeping the parent/guardian informed about parent advisory groups, support groups, and parent training (Family Involvement), 2) the parent/guardian receiving training regarding the secondary transition planning process (Secondary Transition), and 3) parent/guardian and student participation in IEP/IIIP meetings to plan classes necessary for graduation and educational experiences that will prepare the child for success after high school (Secondary Transition).</p> <p>While these areas will receive district attention in this plan, these areas are not significant using the 2.5 indicator for high concern</p>	2004-05	Medium
Administrator	<p>The administrator survey (provided by the state) was sent out to all administrators (i.e., principals) within the school district. Out of the 16 surveys sent out, 14 were returned (88% return rate). Average ratings at or above 3 were viewed as being positive while ratings below 2.5 were viewed as being negative. The three highest average ratings (3.4 to 3.6) pertained to 1) special education students in the administrator's building having equal access to extracurricular and nonacademic activities compared to general population (Program Accessibility), 2) special education paraprofessionals being directly supervised by staff that are knowledgeable of the individual student's needs (Paraprofessional Supervision), and 3) building facilities that are accessible and allow all student's to participate fully in the educational programs (Space Accessibility).</p> <p>The three lowest average ratings (2.2 to 2.6) pertained to 1) the administrator being aware of the district's Special Education Parent Advisory Committee (Family Involvement), 2) the administrator being knowledgeable about the local Community Transition Interagency Committee (Secondary Transition), and 3)</p>	2004-05	Medium

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Analysis	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need
	<p>the administrator having post-school follow-up information that is available on students who were in special education on an annual basis to make program decisions (Secondary Transition). Communication and Secondary Transition are identified as Goal areas and will be addressed in this plan.</p>		
General Educator Staff	<p>The general educator survey (provided by the state) was sent out to all regular education teachers within the school district. Out of the 493 surveys sent out, 250 were returned (51% return rate). Average ratings at or above 3 were viewed as being positive while ratings below 2.5 were viewed as being negative. The three highest average ratings (3.1 to 3.6) pertained to 1) communication between special education staff and the general education teacher being effective in helping the students being served (Communication), 2) classroom space being accessible for students who are physically disabled (Space Accessibility), and 3) special education students having equal access to extracurricular and non-academic activities compared to general education students (Program Accessibility).</p> <p>The three lowest average ratings (2.7 to 2.9) pertained to 1) building administration providing the general education teacher with the needed support and services to help students in special education (Administrative Support), 2) the results of the special education evaluations being shared with the general education teacher in ways that are meaningful and provide insights into the student's educational needs (Evaluations), and 3) special education staff being helpful in finding alternate strategies for working with students with possible disabilities that are not currently in special education (Pre-referral).</p>	2004-05	Medium
Paraprofessional	<p>The paraprofessional survey (provided by the state) was sent out to all special education paraprofessionals within the school district. Out of the 173 surveys sent out, 117 were returned (68% return rate). Average ratings at or above 3 were viewed as being positive while ratings below 2.5 were viewed as being negative. The three highest average ratings (3.4 to 3.8) pertained to 1) the paraprofessional feeling that the special education students that they work with have equal access to extracurricular and non-academic activities compared to general education students (Program Accessibility), 2) the school building being physically accessible to the students the paraprofessional serves (Space Accessibility), and 3) the paraprofessional encouraging students to function as independently as possible, given the nature of their disabilities (Independent Functioning).</p> <p>The three lowest average ratings (2.8 to 3.0) pertained to 1) not having the results of the special education evaluation shared with the paraprofessional in ways that are meaningful and provide the paraprofessional with insight into the student's needs (Evaluations), 2) not having the information from IFSP/IEP/IIIP's shared in a way that is useful (Usefulness of IEP), and 3) not meeting with the special education teacher, who directs the paraprofessional, on at least a weekly basis (Paraprofessional Supervision.) While these areas are rated higher than the determined cutoff, the district will address these concerns at the August Para training meetings.</p>	2004-05	Medium

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Analysis	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need
Special Education Staff	<p>Part C:</p> <p>The special education staff survey (provided by the state) was sent out to all special education staff (birth to two) within the school district. Out of the 5 surveys sent out, 2 were returned (40% return rate). Because of the small sample size, any interpretation should be viewed cautiously. Areas of need identified by special education staff were in the areas of training (e.g., receiving the necessary training, in-service, or information to help meet the needs of the children served). Staff responded positively to program accessibility, collaborative efforts, usefulness of collected evaluation information and IEP, and family involvement.</p>	2004-05	Medium
	<p>Part B:</p> <p>The special education staff survey (provided by the state) was sent out to all special education staff (3 to 21) within the school district. Out of the 161 surveys sent out, 114 were returned (71% return rate). Average ratings at or above 3 were viewed as being positive while ratings below 2.5 were viewed as being negative. The three highest average ratings (All 3.8) pertained to 1) special education teacher's feeling that the information they gather in the evaluation process is used in IFSP/IEP/IIP planning (Evaluations), 2) special education teacher's feeling that, in student IEP meetings, reasonable options for programming are not limited because of lack of district resources (Funding), and 3) that the special education teacher assures that student's function as independently as possible, given the nature of their disabilities (Independent Functioning).</p> <p>The three lowest average ratings (2.3 to 2.5) pertained to 1) a post-school follow up process not being in place so that information is available regarding the outcomes of students who have received services in transition (Secondary Transition), 2) training not being provided regarding IEP/IIP, transition planning process, post-secondary training/resources and adult service providers (Secondary Transition), and 3) lacking knowledge about the local Community Transition Interagency Committee efforts (Secondary Transition). The entire area of Secondary Transition will be addressed as a priority in this plan</p>	2004-05	High
Other	<p>The student survey (provided by the state) was sent out to the case managers of all special education students within the school district grades 4 through 12-plus. The case manager requested the student to complete the survey in school and then returned them. It was left to the case manager's discretion if the student was capable of completing the survey. Out of the 497 surveys sent out, 322 were returned (65% return rate).</p> <p>Average ratings at or above 3 were viewed as being positive while ratings below 2.5 were viewed as being negative. The three highest average ratings (3.3 to 3.5) pertained to 1) the student feeling that the IEP/IIP team cares about his/her interests and preferences for the classes they should take (Secondary Transition), 2) the student feeling that they can choose the same activities and programs as other students in school (Program Accessibility), and 3) the student feeling that the special education program and teachers are helpful (Satisfaction).</p> <p>All ratings by the students were above the 2.5 cutoff score used by the Leadership Team. The three</p>	2004-05	Low

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

Stakeholders	Stakeholder Data Analysis	School Year(s) Data Collected	Degree of Need
	<p>lowest average ratings (2.6 to 2.9) pertained to 1) the student being involved in the IEP/IHP team meetings (IEP Participation), 2) the student having access to a variety of community work experiences including paid and unpaid, apprenticeships, job shadowing, and internships (Secondary Transition), and 3) the student having a “course of study, “ listing the classes that should be taken, in the IEP/IHP (Secondary Transition). As was mentioned previously, Secondary Transition will be addressed in this plan.</p>		

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

### Record Review Directions

- The analysis must include the total number of records reviewed and the total number of citations for each TSES area, i.e. “5 of 10 secondary transition records lacked a secondary transition evaluation by age 14 or grade nine.”
- Part C and Part B TSES standards should be reported separately. Document whether the TSES standard applies to a Part B or Part C file by inserting an “X” into the corresponding “Part B” or “Part C” column.
- Under the “Compliance Status” column, the district has the choice of labeling the standard as “MDE Noncompliance, District Noncompliance, Concern or Strength”.
- Refer to the MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual for additional directions, definitions of each compliance status label, and record review sampling procedures.
- Each TSES area listed as “MDE noncompliance” or “District noncompliance” must have a corresponding action plan (See Future Action Plan section of this report).

### Record Review Process and Sampling Procedures:

Describe the district’s record review process and sampling procedures:

Three special education staff members attended the state’s MnCIMP training inservice and, in turn, trained eighteen special education staff members in Mounds View during a daylong training session. The eighteen special education staff members were broken into nine teams of two. The 116 records were reviewed by the nine teams over a three day period at the Mounds View District Service Center. The teams were each provided with a laptop computer (with file review software provided by the state) and situated in two rooms. The three staff trainers were available during the three days to answer any questions the teams might have. In addition to the 116 files reviewed, each team was asked to select one file out of the 116 files to do a longitudinal review resulting in nine longitudinal reviews completed. The file review software was used to analyze the record review data.

In total, 1,303 children (24 in Birth to two and 1,279 in 3 through 21) were identified as receiving special education services within the Mounds View school district. A sample size of 65 records, which equaled five percent of all special education records ( $1303 * .05 = 65$ ), was initially chosen. Students were sorted by school/program and then assigned numbers sequentially. The percentage of students in the special education population in Mounds View was broken down by disability and school/program (e.g., Birth to two, 3 to 5, elementary, middle school, etc.). A random numbers table was generated using an Excel program and students were selected randomly. As the sample size grew, only those students whose number was randomly selected and who met the criteria for keeping the sample size proportionate by disability and school/program were selected. After the initial 65 student records were identified, an additional 61 records were identified, using the random numbers table, to increase the number of records in each ethnic and gender category, as well as to increase the number of records in certain schools/programs so that interpretation of results for these schools/programs would be based on larger sample sizes. In total, 116 files (5 from Birth to two and 111 from 3 to 21), which accounted for 9% of all files, were identified and reviewed by nine teams.

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### Record Review Directions

TSES Reference Number	TSES Compliance Area	Part B	Part C	Record Review Analysis	Compliance Status
3.1.1	Notice of Proposed Evaluation / Reevaluation Plan	X		20 out of 96 records (21%) received a citation in this area. 9 out of 96 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.1.5	Evaluation / Reevaluation Timelines	X		25 out of 95 records (26%) received a citation in this area. 6 out of 95 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.2.2	Frequency of Reevaluation	X		23 out of 74 records (31%) received a citation in this area. 4 out of 74 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.2.7	Evaluation Materials and Procedures	X		22 out of 97 records (23%) received a citation in this area. 14 out of 97 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.2.7C	Evaluation Materials and Procedures (Part C)		X	1 out of 4 records (25%) received a citation in this area. 0 out of 4 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.2.9	Secondary Transition Evaluation	X		9 out of 30 records (30%) received a citation in this area. 4 out of 30 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.2.12	Evaluation Report	X		35 out of 100 records (35%) received a citation in this area. 21 out of 100 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.4.10C	SLD Written Report	X		8 out of 16 records (50%) received a citation in this area. 2 out of 16 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
3.7	Team Override Documentation	X		3 out of 3 records (100%) received a noncompliance/concern in this area. Upon further review of each file, there was not a question of eligibility for special education services through an override to the criteria for each student but lack of sufficient written documentation in the ESR.	MDE Noncompliance
4.1.3	IEP Team Members	X		30 out of 111 records (27%) received a citation in this area. 19 out of 111 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### Record Review Directions

4.3.5	Start Date of IEP	X		22 out of 112 records (20%) received a citation in this area. 10 out of 112 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
4.3.6	IEP’s Reviewed Every 12 Months	X		21 out of 104 records (20%) received a citation in this area. 8 out of 104 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
4.3.10	Transfer of Rights	X		4 out of 17 records (24%) received a citation in this area. 2 out of 17 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
4.4	Interim IEP	X		1 out of 3 records (33%) received a citation in this area. 1 out of 3 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
4.17.2	IFSP Timelines (Part C)		X	1 out of 4 records (25%) received a citation in this area. 1 out of 4 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance
5.13.2	Functional Behavior Assessment	X		8 out of 17 records (47%) received a citation in this area. 3 out of 17 records received a “concern” in this area.	MDE Noncompliance

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### Longitudinal Review Directions

- 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 include 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 Analysis	Degree of Need
Internal Consistency	Six out of 9 student files were determined to be internally consistent. In addition, for at least 8 of the 9 files, the reviewers concluded that the evaluation was consistent with the evaluation report, the evaluation results were explained, the evaluation report contained adequate documentation to determine eligibility, the PLEP data were current, and the objectives were instructional. Areas of concern were as follows: Four out of the 9 files did not have goals that were measurable while 3 out of the 9 files did not have the PLEP correspond with the evaluation information, did not have goals tied to the PLEP data, did not have services align with student needs, and did not have adaptations tied to student needs as identified in the IEP/ER.	Medium
Conferred Benefit	Benefit was conferred for 6 out of the 9 student files reviewed. In addition, for 8 of the 9 files, services were deemed adequate for the identified need. Areas of concern were as follows: In 4 out of the 9 files, the reviewers indicated that the PLEP data did not document student progress over the three years. Furthermore, for 3 out of the 9 files, the reviewers concluded that the services, goals, and adaptations were not responsive to changing student needs.  The longitudinal data will require further review of student files to determine whether the three students received conferred benefit and/or whether the documentation needs to be improved.	Medium

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

## Summary of Findings

- Annually address one or more of the following reporting categories through a formative summary synthesizing all compliance and program data into a broad narrative response. When completing this section, information from each area reported in previous years' reports should remain to provide a summary of data and/or trends over years.
- Include relevant record review, longitudinal review, stakeholder, and program evaluation data for each reporting area.
- Address all summary of finding reporting categories by the year prior to MDE validation.
- 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).
- Refer to the 2004 MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual for additional directions, program evaluation indicators, and examples.

Reporting Categories	Analysis	Year(s) Addressed	Degree of Need
Part C: Child Find	<p>Based on the 2005 file review and the 2003-04 MDE ECSE District Profile, the area of Child Find is the area with a higher degree of needing more review. There are two areas that require further investigation in this area: The number of children identified under the age of 1 and compliance with the 45-day timeline from point of referral. The expectation is that we should be serving a higher percentage of children under age 1 than the .67% currently being served. However, it was recently shared that the percentage figures used in the MDE ECSE Profile were based on the current year's Kindergarten enrollment. In a district with declining enrollment, most notably at the Kindergarten level (a reduction of approximately 6% per year for the past four years) the district will want to look at more accurate numbers to determine whether the number of children at this age being identified and served in special education is appropriate and closer to what the state and federal governmental offices are expecting.</p> <p>The second area is compliance with the 45 day timeline from the point of referral. According to the file review at least one file was not completed within the 45 days and there was a concern about another file not being completed within the required timeline. Both files identified in the file review process had justification for why the 45 day time limit was exceeded which seemed appropriate. However, it does bring up a need to do further investigation into how often and for what reasons the 45 day time requirement might be exceeded. After gathering more data, necessary action steps will be determined.</p>		
Part C: Settings/LRE			
Part C: Family Involvement			

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### Summary of Findings

Reporting Categories	Analysis	Year(s) Addressed	Degree of Need
<p>Part B: Child Find (Public, Non-public, and separate sites)</p>	<p><b>Child Find</b> All schools have teams of staff ready to plan and help implement pre-service interventions. The psychologists have just completed a revision of the Pre-Referral Intervention section of the district’s IEP Manager’s manual. These teams help teachers identify the problems and help prescribe strategies that have been successful. To help with this task, the district has purchased two measurement tools, Just 5 Clicks, a data warehouse for student achievement information, and Aimsweb, a progress monitoring system. This data is very important in watching students rate of learning and identifying early, which students may not be progressing. The non-public schools also have a team of staff, including special education, that meet to discuss the needs of students. Classroom teachers bring information to the group to determine if an evaluation is indicated. A new position at the elementary levels has been created to help teachers directly set up and monitor documented interventions and complete initial evaluations. Before an evaluation is started, all pre-referral information is collected; parents are involved in the decision to evaluate and the plan for evaluation. All buildings have resources to help them complete a non-discriminatory evaluation. However, what we found through the self-review process, teachers are not performing this adequately. This is identified as a need for 2005-06. Teachers will be asked to send a copy of their non-discriminatory evaluations to their coordinators, so that we can ensure that they are being done.</p>		

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

**Summary of Findings**

<b>Reporting Categories</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Year(s) Addressed</b>	<b>Degree of Need</b>
<p>Part B: Settings/LRE</p>	<p>LRE The Mounds View School District has a strong and long history of providing a comprehensive continuum of services within the district. Each building has the capacity to serve students in settings I –II, and setting III when necessary for all disabilities. We have developed elementary cluster programs in two of our schools to meet the needs of our students with moderate to severe and multiply disabled. These students then go to their neighborhood middle school and high school. In addition, there is a district wide setting III program for elementary students with emotional and behavioral disabilities. This program has the capacity for 12 students. All other elementary students with an EBD disability are served in their own schools. Mounds View also serves as host to several setting IV EBD programs: Bridges, Elementary EBD/ASD, Oak Grove Middle and High School and Oak Grove Adult Transition. We also collaborate with Roseville to provide services for our students with severe autism. Mounds View provides the elementary services and Roseville provides the secondary services. The programs are all located in schools and serve as a setting III option. All students for whom it’s appropriate spend time with their typical peers. Our community options for 3-5 year old students have always been focused on creating options for students within existing early childhood programs for non-handicapped children being served by both public and private programs. All ECSE students either receive special education services in a pre-school program if that is appropriate or have the opportunity for an integrated environment based on individual needs. In addition, students have been able to attend regular pre-school programs for some time and be in special education classrooms for more time depending on the needs of the student. Services for student in every building range from mainstream classroom support to small group instruction both in and out of the classroom. Special education teachers may co-teach with general education teachers or work with students individually. Most buildings provide resource room support. Paraprofessionals are also used for inclusion activities. Teacher collaboration is crucial. The district feels that we are using our intermediate district for only the students who are very difficult to serve. We have gone from having 75 students placed in 916 programs 8 years ago to having only 25 students placed there this past year. To make this happen, the district has worked on increasing the capacities of our buildings to meet the needs of our students, such as recently adding a middle school program to support students who have high sensory needs, need social skill development and small structured classroom instruction. Mounds View is committed to continuing to place students in the least restrictive environment. The district is interested in reviewing data as it relates to placement of students of color or of another ethnic group in lesser or more restrictive settings.</p>		
	<p align="center">District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):</p>		

**Summary of Findings**

<b>Reporting Categories</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Year(s) Addressed</b>	<b>Degree of Need</b>
<p>Part B: Family Involvement</p>	<p>Parental activities include: From 2001 - 2004 Parent conferences and program reviews, students 14 and older are invited. Parent representation on all district task forces Continue to develop Parent Advisory Group Parent representation on the Special Education Advisory Committee Development of an Autism Spectrum Disorder Parent Support Group</p> <p>Family Involvement, From 2004 – 2005 All of the above We have a parent representative on the CTIC. Also, our Special Education Advisory Committee has 4 members who are parents. They have been actively involved in the MNCIMP process. Parents of students who have more significant disabilities such as DCD or Autism seem to be more actively involved in their child’s program than parents of students who have milder disabilities. It seems that parents of students with EBD are somewhat less likely to be continuously involved. There may be less involvement with students of color and sometimes school have difficulty getting parents to come in. This may be more indicative of poverty than race, however. We get a similar rate of parent participation with regard to IEP meetings, etc. across all settings.</p>		

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

## Summary of Findings

Reporting Categories	Analysis	Year(s) Addressed	Degree of Need
Part B: Secondary Transition	<p>Secondary Transition 2001-2003: District evaluated transition services in order to coordinate efforts of transition activities occurring across the district to determine a more systematic approach to transition planning and instruction. A continuum of transition services was reviewed and clarified. The first focus will continue to be in the secondary schools to provide a curriculum rich in opportunities to develop independent life skills as the transition areas dictate. Secondly, Oak Grove Adult Transition Program and the Mounds View Area Learning Center will overlap to provide for the needs of students who need a more functional approach to transition or who need academic credits to graduate. Flexibility between these two programs has provided more options for students who are not DCD. These students may have dropped out otherwise. Also, the Career and Life Transition Program has expanded to include the more severe students at the same site. These students were previously served by TSE Inc. A third option is being developed for high school students who need an emphasis on more functional skills and a strong community component. Many of these students have neurobiological disabilities and have unique needs programmatically. Previously these students have been placed at Transition with 916.</p> <p>A Resource Guide for all services is being planned for the entire staff. This guide will provide a description of services across disability areas, characteristics of students needing these services, and information about how to access these options. This guide will be available for the school year of 2002-2003. Further development will include a district guide to transition goals that coordinate grad standards, transition areas, and a link to interagency services.</p> <p>2004-2005 The focus over the last years was to organize and develop more options for students who need transition services. These services have been very successful in meeting the needs of more students. The program for the students with more neurological problems ran for one year. The year did not go as well as we had hoped in part because we planned for a critical mass of students and by the time school started most students had moved. We started the year with 2 students. Both were students of color. After a year, the district made a decision to not continue the program. The resource guide is still in process. The transition areas have been matched to the standards and the product is ready to print and use in the fall. The focus for the next year is in completing and refining the Transition Resource Guide, complete with a roadmap of services from Early Childhood to age 21. Our surveys showed that the communication piece of transition and the link to interagency services is crucial. Students are evaluated in the 5 transition areas using one of either the Enderle Severson or the Transition Planning Inventory, TPI. At the middle school level, interviews and future planning activities are used to gather information from students and their parents. IEP goals and activities are created from that information. Survey results indicated that parents were positive about their input into the development of the IEP. They wanted to receive more information/training about transition planning process and how that indicated what classes the students should take to accomplish their IEP goals. Family involvement with the CTIC has been limited and the results of the survey showed that this information has been missing. Mounds View does have an active parent participating on the CTIC. We have not collected our own district data in this area.</p>		

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

## Current Year Action Planning Directions

\*Use the information reported in the district's prior year action plan(s), which addressed areas identified in the prior report as **high need** and/or **non-compliant**, to complete the following components, each 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(ies):** 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) \*

<b>*Goal Statement:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase student achievement by training and supporting teachers to make data-driven decisions about implementing effective instructional strategies.</li> <li>2. Complete our data collection for Monitoring and Compliance and Program Effectiveness.</li> </ol>
-------------------------	--

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
Students will continue to show increased achievement in reading and math.	*Use NWEA data to set goals. *Develop progress mon. tools *Train tchrs- more strategies	NWEA scores	Reading: 86% made normative growth. 46% made a year's growth in a year. Math: 78% made normative growth. 42% made a year's growth in a year.	Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	X
				Other: explain	
All data will be collected and analyzed by April of 2005 and problem areas will be identified.	*Team identified and trained *Random sample drawn * SEAC to review and summarize.	Data from file reviews, longitudinal reviews, and stakeholder surveys.	All was completed. Evidence is in this report.	Outcome Met	X
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
* DPRS will be operating fully. *Minimum standards for core classes *SpEd. Adv/ Parent Advisory	* Work group essential skills aligned with Mn standards.	*All teachers are using *Finished documents *Number of meetings	*All teachers used DPRS for IEPs. *LA finished. Working on math. *Met with SEAC 4 times. 1 mtg to discuss PA	Outcome Met	X
				Outcome Continue	X

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

## Future Year Action Planning Directions

Complete the following components to address areas identified in the current report as **high need** and /or **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(ies):** 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 only prior to submitting the MNCIMP:SR Report due 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 (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.

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

**Future Year Action Plan(s)**

**Goal Statement:**

Goal #1. Continue to increase student achievement on the NWEA and Alternate Assessments based on data-driven decisions regarding effective instructional strategies.

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
<p>Increase the number of special education students for whom the NWEA is an appropriate assessment who will meet or exceed individually determined target scores on the NWEA using national norms.</p> <p>Reading: Goal is to have 55% of the students make one years growth in a year's time and 90% make normative growth during the year.</p> <p>Math: Goal is to have 50 % of the students make a year's growth in a year's time and 82% make normative growth during the year.</p>	<p>Each special ed teacher will receive a list of their students and the expected growth targets</p> <p>Teachers will be given training and support to use data-driven practices to measure progress on an on-going basis in order to make adjustments in their instruction. (The district will be exploring the use of Aimsweb as one strategy this next year.)</p> <p>Teachers will continue to be given training and support on effective instructional intervention strategies in order to better meet the needs of their students in the areas of reading and math.</p>	<p>The district will use spring NWEA scores to determine the number of students who have met or exceeded their targeted growth.</p> <p>As a mid-year measure, the district will use the NWEA MAP to determine whether individual students are on track to meet their targets.</p>		<p>Outcome Met</p> <p>Outcome Continue</p> <p>Other: explain</p> <p>Outcome Continue</p> <p>Other: explain</p> <p>Outcome Continue</p> <p>Other: explain</p>	

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

**Future Year Action Planning Directions**

**Future Year Action Plan(s)**

**Goal Statement:** Goal # 2. Improve implementation of overall due process procedures documentation, specifically in the areas of evaluation summary reports, non-discriminatory evaluations and compliance with timelines.

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
All Evaluation Summary Reports (ESR) will address all critical	Each elementary school will have a part-time teacher	As mentioned in the Strategies section of this goal, there will be		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

**Future Year Action Plan(s)**

<b>Goal Statement:</b>	Goal # 2. Improve implementation of overall due process procedures documentation, specifically in the areas of evaluation summary reports, non-discriminatory evaluations and compliance with timelines.
------------------------	--

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
components as outlined in the Evaluation Plan and the criteria rules and include appropriate documentation of eligibility	<p>assigned to support special ed teams in completing all initial evaluations. These teachers will have specific training in writing ESRs.</p> <p>Exemplars of ESRs will be completed and shared with all special education staff as models in a staff development activity.</p> <p>As another staff development activity, special education teachers will be trained using an abbreviated file review and longitudinal review process. Then in groups of eight will be released for one day to complete file reviews. This will reinforce the expectations of a complete and quality ESR.</p> <p>The district will refine the Evaluation Section of the District Due Process manual.</p>	an ongoing file review process beginning in January. Data will be collected on most recent ESRs to determine compliance.		Other: explain	
All ESRs completed on students of color and from other cultures	See strategies from above	Copies of any evaluations completed on students of color or		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

**Future Year Action Plan(s)**

<b>Goal Statement:</b>	Goal # 2. Improve implementation of overall due process procedures documentation, specifically in the areas of evaluation summary reports, non-discriminatory evaluations and compliance with timelines.
------------------------	--

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
will comply with standards for non-discriminatory evaluation.	Training and exemplars in non-discriminatory evaluation will be developed and provided to all special ed staff	from another culture will be sent to the district coordinator for review.		Other: explain	
All timelines will be met or clearly documented as to why they were not met.	See strategies from above	See above.		Outcome Met	
	As a part of the file review and longitudinal review, due process training will be provided, including visual prompts.	Data will be collected from the files reviewed as to their compliance. Current baseline from the district self review is at 26% non-compliance.		Outcome Continue	
	Written guidelines for our electronic IEP program will be completed, including how to correctly record dates and which dates are the most important.	Timelines not met will be monitored by a report from DPRS that tells about unmet timelines.		Other: explain	

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

## Future Year Action Planning Directions

Complete the following components to address areas identified in the current report as **high need** and /or **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(ies):** 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 only prior to submitting the MNCIMP:SR Report due 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 (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.

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### Future Year Action Plan(s)

**Goal Statement:** Goal #3. Improve communication regarding special education services and initiatives among staff and between staff and parents.

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
Teachers and paraprofessionals will have a clear understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities.	<p>Paraprofessional training before school starts to reinforce their role as a paraprofessional and what is the process for communication when problems exist.</p> <p>Paraprofessionals will be assigned specific teachers who will supervise them and be responsible for their evaluation at the end of the school year.</p> <p>Paraprofessionals will be asked to sign that they understand their role in meeting the educational needs of special education students and the appropriate chain of communication.</p> <p>Teachers will be informed of the information shared with paraprofessionals.</p>	Building teams will be closely monitored for problems in communication. Data will be collected on the number of issues that occur.		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
Members of a Parent Advisory will be identified and trained to act as advisory to the district about special education issues, support communication between the district and other parents, and support other parents of students with disabilities in areas of need.	<p>Parents will be identified as members of the Parent Advisory by getting referrals from teachers and by advertising in school papers.</p> <p>Training will be provided specifically focused on developing mission and beliefs, goals and outcomes.</p>	A Parent Advisory exists.		Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

## Future Year Action Planning Directions

Complete the following components to address areas identified in the current report as **high need** and /or **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(ies):** 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 only prior to submitting the MNCIMP:SR Report due 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 (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.

## Future Year Action Plan(s)

<b>Goal Statement:</b>	Goal #4. Continue to improve Secondary Transition programs and services through better alignment, organization and communication about district and community transition activities and resources.				
Complete this section using the action plans from the current report..			Complete this section prior to submitting next year’s report.		
<b>Desired Outcome</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>What collected data will give evidence of progress?</b>	<b>Progress/Results Analysis</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>X</b>
There will be a defined process and roadmap used by all middle	The Transition Guide will be updated to include a roadmap	A finished Transition Guide		Outcome Met	<input type="checkbox"/>
				Outcome Continue	<input type="checkbox"/>

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

**Future Year Action Plan(s)**

**Goal Statement:** Goal #4. Continue to improve Secondary Transition programs and services through better alignment, organization and communication about district and community transition activities and resources.

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
school, high school and transition programs and the parents of the affected students, to have a better coordinated and clear process for transitions goals both at school and in the community.	of services beginning at age 14 describing the transition process and community resources. This roadmap will be shared with staff and parents in order to assist in coordinated planning for students.  The district will continue to develop essential skill outcomes for at-risk and special education students in High School in the content areas of Language Arts and Math and Science and Social Studies.	The district has completed the functional alignment of skills and standards, the Language Arts alignment, and is working on Math. Math will be completed during the course of the 2005-06 school year.		Other: explain	
				Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	
				Outcome Met	
				Outcome Continue	
				Other: explain	

MNCIMP: SR	District Name: Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):
------------	--

### Data Management Plan Directions

- Collect BST and MCA State Test scores (for grades indicated below), Graduation Rates and Drop Out rates annually.
- Collect and report record review (Part B and Part C) and longitudinal record review data for the report due the year prior to the district’s scheduled MDE validation review.
- Report data from all required stakeholder groups listed in the below chart by the year prior to the district’s scheduled MDE validation review. 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.
- Under the “Timing of Measurements” column, delete the text for all categories except those listed as “annually”, and indicate the school year the district plans to collect data in each area. Complete the “Year Collected” column after the data has been collected for all categories except those already listed as “Annually”.
- See the 2004 MNCIMP:SR Guidelines and Resources Manual for detailed sampling procedures and additional directions.

Data Sources and Targeted Population	Timing of Measurements	Analysis Procedures	Year Collected
BST State Test Scores Grades 8 and 10	Annually	Comparison to State-wide and strata data	Annually
MCA State Test Scores Grades 3,5, 7, 10 & 11	Annually	Comparison to State-wide and strata data	Annually
Graduation Rates	Annually	Comparison to State-wide and strata data	Annually
Drop Out Rates	Annually	Comparison to State-wide and strata data	Annually
Part B: Record Reviews Ages 3 to 21 special education students	Validation delayed - not until 2006-07 2008-09	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Part C: Record Reviews Birth to age 3 early childhood infants and toddlers	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Longitudinal Record Reviews	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):

### Data Management Plan Directions

Data Sources and Targeted Population	Timing of Measurements	Analysis Procedures	Year Collected
Family Stakeholder Information (Part B)	2008-09	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Family Stakeholder Information (Part C)	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Administrator Stakeholder Information	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	
General Education Staff Stakeholder Information	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Special Education Staff Stakeholder Information (Part C)	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Special Education Staff Stakeholder Information (Part B)	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Paraprofessional Stakeholder Information	Same as above	Compare to 2004-05 data	
Other			
Other			
Other			

MNCIMP: SR

District Name:

Cooperative/Education District Name (if applicable):