

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2021**

**Georgia**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2023**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

### Executive Summary

During FFY 2021, Georgia experienced a beginning emergence from the COVID pandemic, face-to-face instruction and increased instructional strategies for all learners were hallmarks for the 2021-2022 school year. Face-to-face instruction did not return to full pre-pandemic levels with some Local Education Agencies (LEAs) continuing to offer a variety of virtual options for students. Many LEAs retained the virtual options because they determined that the virtual options offered a value-added approach to augment in person learning. Participation in high stakes testing for all students, including students with disabilities, returned to pre-pandemic levels in the 2021-2022 school year. Georgia met all participation goals for students with disabilities on Indicator 3A of the SPP/APR as a result. All participation levels were above 95% and showed an improvement from the rates of 60-77% the prior year. Assessment results from the 2021-2022 school year exhibited high variability due to the two years of instruction heavily impacted by the pandemic. In recognition of the extensive needs of students following the pandemic, the Division for Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) implemented or continued a number of initiatives targeting students with disabilities designed to improve student outcomes and aid in teacher retention. An extensive implementation of Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)) and continuation of initiatives such as the School Completion Toolkit (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>) were in place to support the learning recovery of students with disabilities. The nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>) with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families. Georgia's DSESS also recognized the need to support school level administrators in meeting the needs of students with disabilities and implemented the School Based Administrators Academy (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Sp-Ed-and-School-Based-Admins.aspx>). Georgia's Annual Performance Report for 2021-2022 continued to demonstrate Georgia's resilience and commitment to providing services for students with disabilities and building inclusive partnerships with families and communities.

Georgia met targets for the following SPP/APR Indicators: 2 (Dropout), 3A (Assessment Participation for grades 4, 8, and high school), 3B (Reading Proficiency, Group C, high school), 3B (Math Proficiency, Group C, high school), 3C (Reading Proficiency, Group B, Grade 8), 3C (Math Proficiency Group B, Grade 8, and Group C high school), 4B (Significant Discrepancy), 5C (Educational Environment, Separate Settings), 6C (Early Childhood Environment- Services in the home), 7A (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive social-emotional outcomes), 7B (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills), 7C (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs), 9 (Disproportionate Representation), 14B (Post-School Outcomes- Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed), and 14C (Post-School Outcomes Enrolled in Higher Education, or some other type of postsecondary training, Competitively Employed, or employed in some other employment). Indicator 1 (Graduation), and Indicator 17 (State Systemic Improvement Plan) were both set at Baseline level in this FFY 2021 report.

Georgia did not meet targets but had no slippage for the following Indicators: 3B (Reading Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4, and Group B, Grade 8), 3B (Math Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4, and Group B, Grade 8), 3C (Reading Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4), 3D (Reading Proficiency Gaps in Group B, Grade 8), 3D (Math Proficiency Gaps, Group A, Grade 4), 4A (Significant Discrepancy), 5A (Educational Environment, Inside the regular classroom 80% or more), 5B (Educational Environment, Inside the regular classroom <40%), 7A (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive social-emotional outcomes), 7C (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs), 11 (Child Find), 12 (Early Childhood Transition), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 A (Post-School Outcomes- Enrolled in Higher Education), 15 (Resolution Sessions), and 16 (Mediations).

Georgia had slippage in SPP/APR Indicators: 3C (Reading Proficiency, Group C, High School), 3C (Math Proficiency, Group A, Grade 4), 3D (Reading Proficiency Gaps in Group A, Grade 4, and group C, High School), 3D (Math Proficiency Gaps in Group B, Grade 8, and Group C, High School), 6A (Early Childhood Environment - Receiving Majority of Services in the Regular Childhood Program), 6B (Early Childhood Environment - Receiving Majority of services in Separate Classroom, Separate School, or Residential Facility), 7A (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive social-emotional outcomes), 7B (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills), 7C (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs), 8 (Parent Satisfaction Survey), and 10 (Disproportionate Representation by Specific Eligibility Category).

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has continued to have a supportive stance in addressing the needs of students, teachers, leaders, and families as they return to school following the COVID pandemic of the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years. The DSESS provided ongoing technical assistance and guidance for special education leaders, as well as, partnered with other divisions to address the needs of all leaders. Georgia has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework in an effort to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiansights.com/wholechild.html>).

### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The FFY 2021 data set is the most comprehensive since the onset of COVID and is far more robust than the prior two years' of COVID impacted data. Unfortunately, Georgia's data depicts the impact of COVID in a number of areas, but most notably in the area of Indicator 3 Assessment. Assessment data reflects erratic performance trends. While the results reflect slippage in some of the grade level assessments aligned with regular academic standards, a high degree of caution in the interpretation of these results is urged. Georgia is, and has been, implementing numerous robust strategies, programs, and supports to address learning recoupment for all Georgia's students, especially students with disabilities. The results of these efforts will require time to show an impact in assessment results.

Georgia's data for Indicator 4 was significantly impacted by COVID as discipline data is lag data. In the 2020-2021 school year suspension rates were dramatically decreased, greater than 70 percent, because virtual instruction continued to be intermittently used throughout the state. The number of LEAs included in this analysis based upon the minimum n and cell sizes is the smallest number reflected in many years.

### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

### General Supervision System:

#### The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

DSESS implemented an effective system of General Supervision to complete the following tasks: (1) Support practices that improve educational results and functional outcomes; (2) Use multiple methods to identify and correct noncompliance within one year; and (3) Use mechanisms to encourage and support improvement and to enforce compliance. The GaDOE's system for General Supervision included eight components: (1) State Performance Plan; (2) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation; (3) Integrated Monitoring Activities; (4) Fiscal Management; (5) Data on Processes and Results; (6) Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions; (7) Effective Dispute Resolution; and (8) Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development.

The DSESS provided appropriate accountability to ensure that LEAs complied with federal regulations. Fidelity of compliant practices was enforced by using a tiered monitoring system that enabled the Division staff to "monitor" all LEAs every year. The DSESS monitored each LEA every year through a tiered monitoring system to ensure timely identification and correction of any identified noncompliance. At each tier, the DSESS conducted a systematic collection and analysis of data to inform compliant practices and improve results. The State provided increased or more intensive supports based on the analysis of data. An additional critical component of Georgia's continuous improvement monitoring is Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM), which is conducted using a four-year cycle. The CFM process is intensive and examines all components of a system's implementation of IDEA. The State monitors at least sixty LEAs each year in the process allowing all LEAs to be reviewed within the four-year cycle. The standard schedule resumed beginning in 2021-2022 following interruption due to COVID-19.

Tier 1 monitoring procedures were implemented for all LEAs to enforce compliance and improve results. Tier 1 activities included items such as a review of LEA Determination Data, Continuation of Services Data, Fiscal Risk Assessment, and Child Find Initial Evaluation Timelines.

Tier 2 monitoring procedures were implemented for a targeted group of LEAs based upon areas of noncompliance at Tier 1, such as exceeding the 60-day timeframe for Child Find Initial Evaluations. In addition to noncompliance, some LEAs may be targeted to receive supports based on local performance on indicators such graduation, dropout, and young children's outcomes.

Tier 3 monitoring procedures were implemented for a targeted group of LEAs and differentiated to meet their compliance and/or performance needs, which were triggered by the previous tier's data (i.e., Significant Disproportionality) or the CFM cycle.

Tier 4 monitoring procedures were implemented for any LEAs that demonstrated difficulty in the timely correction of noncompliance.

Using all four tiers of monitoring, the DSESS ensured timely identification and correction of noncompliance and fostered a "continuous improvement monitoring process."

#### Example of Monitoring Process -

In Tier 1 for Child Find, the GaDOE provided all LEAs with monitoring and analysis tools, such as spreadsheets with calculations of the 60-day timeline. LEAs who used Georgia Online IEP (GO-IEP, the voluntary State IEP program), had timelines automatically calculated in alignment with their local calendars. Tier 2 supports were provided for LEAs that did not meet the 100% target for completion of initial evaluations in the 60-day timeline. Those LEAs were required to submit an update regarding their review of policies, procedures, and practices to support correction of the non-compliance, a list of students reported late along with the rationale for the delay, and any other relevant supporting information.

#### Examples of Monitoring Activities for all SPP/APR indicators -

Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM) - The DSESS conducted reviews to evaluate due process procedural compliance for LEAs. The DSESS reviewed records from all LEAs in the CFM process which included IEPs, eligibility reports, and transition plans. LEAs are monitored in the CFM process on a four-year cycle. Some LEAs may be monitored more frequently if deemed High Risk. Risk assessment is completed to determine if an LEA falls into the high-risk category. High-risk LEAs are defined as:

- showing evidence of serious or chronic compliance problems
- having previous financial monitoring/audit findings
- having a high number of complaints from parents and other stakeholders about program implementation.

Fiscal Monitoring - Monitoring of federal programs is conducted to ensure that all children have a fair and equal educational opportunity. CFM emphasizes accountability for using federal resources wisely and supports LEAs in effective program implementation using federal allocations. The IDEA fiscal statutes are the primary framework for fiscal monitoring. Uniform Grant's Guidance, along with other pertinent federal regulations, guides the fiscal monitoring process of CFM.

Data Verifications and Audits - DSESS selected a sampling of LEAs to provide data verification based on certain risk factors. In these instances, the LEAs provided appropriate documentation to support valid and accurate data reporting practices. This level of verification impacted a target group of LEAs.

Dispute Resolution - The DSESS provided desk audits to resolve issues of noncompliance as a part of the implementation of the dispute resolution processes. These data and documentation were used to support identification and/or correction of noncompliance for LEAs identified through a complaint investigation or a due process hearing.

Disproportionality Compliance Review - The DSESS required all LEAs if identified as having some type of disproportionality determination to complete the Compliance Review. The DSESS reviewed these data and other pertinent documentation to determine compliance.

Timeline Reviews - Timeline summary reports are submitted as a part of the required publicly reported data to the DSESS. Each LEA submits a summary of its performance in meeting requirements for timely completion of evaluation/eligibility for initial referrals to special education, and timely transition of young children from Babies Can't Wait (Part C) to Special Education (Part B). These data for the fiscal year (July 1 – June 30) are reported by July 31 each year.

The following link provides additional information regarding Georgia's General Supervision processes:

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Georgia%27s-Continuous-Improvement-Monitoring-Process-%28GCIMP%29.aspx>

### Technical Assistance System:

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) includes focused levels of support, such as the GaDOE directing root cause analysis and monitoring of Corrective Action Plan (CAP) development and correction. TTA may also include assistance with data analysis, improvement planning, identification of promising practices, training in identified needs, and other requests for resources that would facilitate program change. Successful TTA requires an ongoing negotiated and collaborative relationship. TTA leads to a purposeful, planned series of activities that result in changes to policy, program, or operations that support increased capacity at the state, LEA, and school levels. To achieve these outcomes, the collaboration often includes the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS), Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), local colleges and universities, and national partners to provide additional technical assistance to LEAs.

TTA opportunities can be both voluntary and prescribed. For example, LEAs that are determined Significantly Disproportionate must participate in Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services, but systems may voluntarily participate in Disproportionality TTA and reserve 15% of IDEA funds to address overrepresentation difficulties that do not meet the threshold for Disproportionality determination.

During FFY21, monthly Technical Assistance (TA) was provided to all LEAs through Monthly Special Education Directors Webinars which can be accessed at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Directors%27-Webinars.aspx>. The webinars provided timely information regarding topics such as Assistive Technology, English Learners and Students with Disabilities, IEP Development, and Extended School Year Services.

Georgia also provided LEAs an IDEA Implementation Manual which is periodically updated at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Implementation-Manual.aspx>. The manual serves as a practical guide for implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and its regulations. The purpose of this manual is to provide practical ideas and best practice information on the implementation of the Georgia Special Education State Rules for administrators, principals, regular education teachers, special education teachers, related services providers, parents, and students with disabilities. When the manual was initiated, technical assistance was conducted in several sessions and was made available to all of Georgia's LEA-level personnel. Georgia has also invested a great deal of effort and resources into a tiered system of supports which can be accessed at Georgia's Tiered System of Supports for Students <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/TieredSystemofSupports.aspx> to provide support for all LEAs and students.

The Collaborative Communities approach is another technical assistance model in which stakeholders are engaged in solving critical problems and supporting each other in their efforts. The Collaborative Communities are regularly scheduled (typically monthly) regional technical assistance meetings that all Georgia's LEAs may attend. Participants share common roles, responsibilities, and/or desired outcomes. They deepen their knowledge and expertise by sharing information, materials, and resources. These groups utilize focused action and shared leadership to work together to accomplish common goals. District liaisons (DLs) from the DSESS participate in these monthly sessions. The DLs provide updates on GaDOE initiatives and answer questions for stakeholders.

Georgia has continued to strengthen its relationship with National Technical Assistance Centers including the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), National Center for Educational Outcome (NCEO), and the National Center for Systematic Improvement (NCSI). Tools and resources available from IDC are used to assist in data analysis. Georgia has also collaborated with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: the Collaborative (NTACT-C) to address the challenges of dropout prevention, improving graduation rates, and strengthening transition planning services. The Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) provides technical assistance for fiscal reporting.

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

Professional Development (PD) is a constantly improving process in Georgia. PD ranges from a basic level of providing general information to a more targeted and intensive level of learning, which is job-embedded and data-driven with a focus on student achievement and school improvement. Research suggests that to build capacity, a framework that includes understanding the stages of the change process must be used. The stages of change are Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation, Full Implementation, and Sustainability and Innovation. These stages of change require that an LEA commits to a multi-year process of improvement. Georgia is committed to providing all LEAs with ongoing support for instruction, data, and learning resources.

Georgia's State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) houses longitudinal information on student attendance, assessment information, and grades. SLDS also contains the Georgia Learns PD Hub, which has greatly enhanced virtual learning opportunities for LEA district and school-level personnel. There are multiple modules on the platform that provide information about effectively writing IEPs and using the GO-IEP program. There are also numerous instructional provision presentations available on the platform.

The Division of Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) collaborated with many partners at the national, regional, state, and local levels to provide timely and accurate information about available professional development in special education. These collaborations often include the National Technical Assistance Centers, the Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR), and local colleges and universities. The Division's professional development incorporates many factors, including the model and delivery method (job-related or job-embedded) that will be followed and the type of training. In addition, professional development is generally self-directed, based on previous experience, relevant to the needs, and applicable to the specific situation. It is based on data that answers the question "who needs to know what" at the LEA, administrative, school, or specialist level. The various delivery models for professional development include webinars, training module series, videos, and face-to-face conferencing. Some examples of these can be found at:

- 1) Georgiastandards.org Resources and Videos: <https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>
- 2) State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Professional Development Videos: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Personnel-Development-Grant.aspx>
- 3) GaDOE Special Education Professional Learning Resources: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Professional-Learning-Resources-.aspx>
  - Specially Designed Instruction: [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)
  - Georgia Teacher/Provider Retention Program: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>

- High-Leverage Practices: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/HighLeveragePracticesSpEd.aspx>

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia’s State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can’t Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State’s performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia’s data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

### **Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Beginning with the SAP meeting on September 14, 2022, Georgia reviewed a cohesive framework for SPP/APR indicators designed to foster greater involvement in stakeholder engagement, including parent engagement, in the areas of target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. In the framework, the Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following clusters to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback: Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14), Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10), Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12), Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal, and Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3). The SAP had 37 parent members, and all were actively engaged in reviewing the progress data for the SPP/APR Indicators targets that they assisted in establishing the prior school year.

The initial meeting of the SAP on September 14, 2022 focused on Indicator 1 and the data for this Indicator. The calculation for this indicator changed leading to a decrease in the number of students included in the numerator. The result was a significant decrease in the percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma.

The active involvement of the parent members began the prior school year. They were provided with an opportunity to participate in a work group session on September 2, 2021. On September 2, 2021, each SAP member, including parent members, participated in one of the cluster groups. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized presentation format. Prior to facilitating the cluster group, each DSESS facilitator participated in a training session on August 5, 2021 and led a DSESS cluster group on August 11, 2021. All DSESS staff selected a cluster group for the August 11, 2021 session based upon job role and interest. The process and intent in the August 11, 2021 session was the same as that described below for the September 2, 2021 SAP meeting.

For the September 2, 2021 meeting, each DSESS facilitator was provided with a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each SAP group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. The goals for September 2, 2021 cluster work group session were: 1) to review a process for SPP/APR development using cluster groups, 2) evaluate trend data for the specific cluster work group, 3) examine processes for setting targets (i.e., percentage increase per year, averaging, statistical methods, etc.), 4) examine stakeholder requirements (i.e., degree of parent involvement required, encouraging diverse and broad input), and 5) review the plan and mechanism for feedback collection and finalizing targets. For goal 1, facilitators shared a graphic with all SPP/APR Indicators grouped into one of the five clusters (i.e., Group A. High School and Life Outcomes - Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14) to provide a cohesive framework to view the development of the SPP/APR for 2020-2025. The second goal was met by sharing the specific current and longitudinal data for a minimum of 3 years for each Indicator. Longitudinal data for Indicators with new calculations or groups was converted from prior representations using the application of the new calculation and/or groupings. For goal 3, participants were shown a variety of methods for calculating targets (i.e., start with the end goal) and provided with examples. The purpose was to increase knowledge and ownership of the process of target setting with stakeholders. The fourth goal was facilitated by providing specific descriptions of stakeholder feedback requirements from the SPP/APR 2020-2025 Measurement Table. Finally, for goal 5, participants reviewed Georgia's methods and timeline for soliciting input on targets to a wide ranging and diverse group of participants including virtual presentations and feedback sessions, an online survey, and posting of proposed targets for public feedback. On October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. SAP members were provided with additional follow-up opportunities to provide specific feedback on data, targets, improvement strategies and progress. SAP members also had the opportunity to participate in the online SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

Parents in the Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership (PMP) group were provided with the opportunity to participate in a feedback session using the Indicators Cluster Group Framework offered on multiple dates (August 30, 2021, October 26, 2021, and October 27, 2021). These sessions were conducted by the Part B Data Manager and had an emphasis on Indicators 1 and 2 as these Indicators were the most dramatically changed in the new SPP/APR package. Anne Ladd, Family Engagement Specialist for the Georgia Department of Education in DSESS, assisted in facilitating and advertising these sessions. The PMP is a Georgia initiative providing funding for LEAs to employ a parent mentor to support the parents of students with disabilities within the LEA. Parent mentors must have a child with a disability to be employed as mentors. Parent mentors also invited other parents, general and special education teachers, and general and special education leaders in their LEAs to participate in virtual feedback meetings on one of the dates provided.

All of the sessions provided the opportunity for parents to ask questions, make comments about data, suggest possible targets, discuss instructional interventions, and evaluate the longitudinal progress of students. Parents, particularly SAP members, provided numerous suggestions regarding the targets which were all thoughtfully considered. Parent input was valued, and proposed targets were revised based upon the input. For example, when the data and proposed targets for Indicator 3 were provided to the SAP on January 13, 2022, in the morning, the targets were not deemed as appropriately ambitious. As a result, a second input session at the direction of Wina Low, Interim Georgia State Director of Special Education of Special Education, was conducted on January 13, 2022, in the afternoon, and target choices were revised as a result of the discussion.

### **Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

There were nine virtual meeting opportunities to provide feedback on the SPP/APR and initiatives associated with improving outcomes for students. In addition, SAP meetings provided information about specially designed instruction, Georgia's dyslexia initiative, addressing disproportionality, and SSIP initiatives to combat dropping out of school. All presentations provided SAP members with resources for additional information on the implementation of these instructional initiatives as well as the progress of their implementation. Presentations to SAP also provided details of the monitoring of initiatives that were designed to improve student outcomes. State-wide feedback sessions conducted in November and December 2022 were advertised by Parent to Parent and information was distributed in Spanish and English. Further, a Spanish interpreter was available in each of the state-wide sessions for Spanish speakers. All presentations regarding the SPP/APR clearly defined its Indicators, timeframe, and measurement to enhance stakeholder capacity to provide advisement. A companion document, Target Setting for the SPP/APR, was also provided at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The document provided longitudinal data and information on each Results Indicator in the survey.

### **Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

SPP/APR information including proposed targets, SPP/APR Survey, and recorded presentations were publicly posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). Presentations on the website provided a description of the SPP/APR, Indicator data, APR progress, and initiatives used to improve outcomes. The SPP/APR Survey for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was available in December for public participation. A companion document titled Target Setting for the SPP/APR was posted with the survey to enable a review of all longitudinal data to inform participation. The proposed targets were posted for public comments beginning January 9, 2023.

#### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The document, Targets for SPP/APR 2020-2025 (updated November, 2022), was posted on the SPP/APR website (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)) and contained proposed new baselines and targets for Indicators 1 and 17. An additional document on the page titled SPP/APR Target Setting Document contained comprehensive data analysis for public review and enabled an evaluation of longitudinal information for the 2020-2025 SPP/APR. Georgia updates information regarding the SPP/APR at this location. The results of target setting for the SPP/APR 2020-2025 were made available on January 9, 2023, for public comment. The SAP website (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Advisory-Panel-%28SAP%29.aspx>) provides meeting minutes and agendas for each month's SAP meeting. The minutes outline the improvement strategies and instructional initiatives being implemented in Georgia for students with disabilities. The SPP/APR website has expanded the public posting of presentations and documents that provide improvement strategies for students with disabilities.

#### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.**

The GaDOE provides data regarding students with disabilities in our state. The Annual Performance Report is posted on the Special Education webpage at the following link: [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). Georgia's APR is available for the current and previous years.

LEA public Annual Performance Reports are available for public viewing using the following link: [https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/\\_Layout.html](https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/_Layout.html). The user must enter the zip code for the LEA or type the name of the LEA they are interested in viewing.

In addition to the Annual Performance Reports, Georgia's website contains links to SEA, LEA, and School Level Assessment data (suppressed at a cell size of 15). SEA Discipline, Exit, Federal Child Count, Environment, and Personnel data are also posted. The following is a link to these data: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>.

Data for Indicators 1 and 2 are not publicly reported by LEAs as lagging data since Georgia has access to this information earlier than required for SPP/APR. For example, the FFY2019 data for Indicators 1 and 2 are reported on Georgia's Annual Performance Report for the 2019-2020 school year.

#### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

#### **Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

### Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	69.55%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	54.50%	57.60%	57.58%	62.27%	73.46%
Data	56.59%	56.27%	61.11%	62.94%	79.35%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	69.55%	71.55%	72.55%	73.55%	74.55%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia’s State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can’t Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services

- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

There was considerable discussion regarding Georgia's request to OSEP for setting a new baseline for Indicator 1. Ultimately, the decision to request a new baseline was made due to the change in Georgia's methodology. The decision was further supported by an agreement of over 60% of stakeholders surveyed to request a change in the baseline. Stakeholder comments in the nine feedback sessions also supported the request for a new baseline.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	9,566
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1,281
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,908

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
9,566	13,755	79.35%	69.55%	69.55%	N/A	N/A

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) holds high expectations for all students and works to raise the graduation rate of students with Individual Education Programs (IEP) who receive regular education diplomas. The GaDOE supports improved instructional programs and access to the general curriculum for all students. Georgia defines a graduate as a student who exits high school with a Regular High School Diploma (not a Certificate of Attendance or Special Education Diploma). Graduates must have met course and assessment criteria. Georgia offers one diploma for all students. The link below provides information for the assessment and graduation requirements <https://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/State-Board-of-Education/SBOE%20Rules/160-4-2-.48.pdf>

Georgia is reporting data from the 2020-2021 school year. This represents lagged data based on OSEP's requirement to report data as submitted in SY 2020-2021 FS009 Students Exiting Special Education.

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Georgia is requesting a new baseline and targets for Indicator 1. Georgia has modified the calculation of students included in the regular high school diploma rate. The updated methodology aligns with the FS009 Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Exiting Special Education File Specifications. The change has resulted in a decrease in the number of students included in the numerator for the calculation. The number of students included in the numerator for the calculation, and the data for FFY 2021 are no longer comparable to the data from prior years.

While the data for this indicator is no longer comparable to the data from prior years, COVID also impacted this indicator as it is lagging data. Data from the prior reporting year (2019-2020) indicated one of the highest graduation rates ever for students with disabilities. The data was a product of virtual instruction and leniency in attendance. As a result, last year Georgia requested the use of a prior year's information for the initial baseline on the 2020-2025 SPP/APR.

The data in the currently reported year reflects the return of in-person learning and paradoxically the remnants of virtual instruction with students with disabilities. In LEAs returning exclusively to in-person instruction all students, including students with disabilities, were subject to the attendance policies of LEAs. Students with disabilities who may have graduated in the prior year due to leniency in attendance and grading policies were no longer passing courses. As a result, the number of students dropping out increased and the number of students graduating decreased.

Georgia has put a number of highly targeted initiatives in place to address the reduced number of students who are graduating. LEAs targeted in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) are implementing Check and Connect and Early Warning System to address attendance and course completion for students with disabilities. These initiatives are also beginning to be implemented in broader portions of the state. Georgia is also targeting academic deficits through comprehensive statewide professional learning in Specially Designed Instruction through partnerships with technical assistance centers and Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey. Georgia is also continuing the Teacher Retention Project to support and retain special education teachers. Georgia recognizes the need for teacher retention and efficacy in increasing student achievement and subsequently graduation.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	23.56%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	5.70%	5.60%	5.50%	5.40%	23.56%
Data	5.60%	5.74%	5.47%	5.13%	18.47%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	22.56%	21.56%	20.56%	19.56%	18.56%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice

- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	9,566
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	1,281
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,908

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2,908	13,755	18.47%	22.56%	21.14%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

A student is considered a dropout when the student withdraws from school with a withdrawal code corresponding to one of the following reasons: Marriage, Expelled, Financial Hardship/Job, Incarcerated/Under Jurisdiction of Juvenile or Criminal Justice Authority, Low Grades/School Failure, Military, Adult Education/Postsecondary, Pregnant/Parent, Removed for Lack of Attendance, Serious Illness/Accident, and Unknown.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

Students with disabilities who are Incarcerated/Under Jurisdiction of Juvenile or Criminal Justice Authority are not dropouts in Georgia. The Department of Corrections and the Department of Juvenile Justice are both LEAs in Georgia and continue to provide services to students with disabilities who are incarcerated. Students with Disabilities who are incarcerated in local jails and short-term detention facilities are provided services by the LEAs in which the local jails or short-term detention facilities are located. All other withdrawal reasons for dropout indicated above are applicable to students with disabilities.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID also impacted this indicator as it is lag data. Data from the prior reporting year (2019-2020) indicated one of the highest graduation rates and lowest dropout rates ever for students with disabilities. The data was a product of virtual instruction and leniency in attendance. As a result, last year Georgia requested the use of a prior year's information for the initial baseline on the 2020-2025 SPP/APR.

The data in the currently reported year reflects the return of in-person learning and paradoxically the remnants of virtual instruction with students with disabilities. In LEAs returning exclusively to in-person instruction all students, including students with disabilities, were subject to the attendance policies of LEAs. Students with disabilities who may have graduated in the prior year due to leniency in attendance and grading policies were no longer passing courses. As a result, the number of students dropping out increased and the number of students graduating decreased.

Georgia has put a number of highly targeted initiatives in place to address the reduced number of students who are graduating. LEAs targeted in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) are implementing Check and Connect and Early Warning System to address attendance and course completion for students with disabilities. These initiatives are also beginning to be implemented in broader portions of the state. Georgia is also targeting academic deficits through comprehensive statewide professional learning in Specially Designed Instruction through partnerships with technical assistance centers and Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey. Georgia is also continuing the Teacher Retention Project to support and retain special education teachers. Georgia recognizes the need for teacher retention and efficacy in increasing student achievement and subsequently graduation.

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	77.84%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	63.30%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	62.74%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	77.70%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	61.48%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	60.71%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

## **Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

## **FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

### **Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	18,346	19,646	15,072
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,358	1,971	1,446
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,863	15,127	11,590
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,623	1,898	1,574

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	18,341	19,635	19,605
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,355	2,015	2,120
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,831	14,985	15,100
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,619	1,886	1,566

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17,844	18,346	77.84%	95.00%	97.26%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	18,996	19,646	63.30%	95.00%	96.69%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	14,610	15,072	62.74%	95.00%	96.93%	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17,805	18,341	77.70%	95.00%	97.08%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	18,886	19,635	61.48%	95.00%	96.19%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	18,786	19,605	60.71%	95.00%	95.82%	Met target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities

participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

#### **Public Reporting Information**

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

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Georgia's data for assessment reflected a return to pre-pandemic levels for assessment participation. COVID did not impact Indicator 3A. Unfortunately, data for Indicator 3B-3D were adversely impacted. The impact will be described in those sections of the report.

### **3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3A - OSEP Response**

### **3A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	12.77%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	9.17%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	5.50%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	18.93%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	7.91%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	5.69%

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.77%	16.77%	18.77%	20.77%	22.77%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	11.77%	13.17%	15.17%	17.17%	19.17%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	7.50%	9.50%	11.50%	13.50%	15.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	20.93%	22.93%	24.93%	26.93%	28.93%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	9.91%	11.91%	13.91%	15.91%	17.91%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.69%	9.69%	11.69%	13.69%	15.69%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22

- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

There was considerable discussion with stakeholders about the possibility of requesting new baselines in Indicator 3B if the data stabilized with the 2021-2022 administration of the Georgia Milestones assessment. Stakeholders and the DSESS were hopeful that results would reflect some trend stability and improvement necessitating a request for new baselines. Unfortunately, neither of those conditions materialized and no new baselines or targets were requested.

## FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

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

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	16,221	17,098	13,036

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,379	589	262
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	814	865	816

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	16,186	17,000	17,220
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,770	609	425
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,566	1,070	1,195

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,193	16,221	12.77%	14.77%	13.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,454	17,098	9.17%	11.77%	8.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,078	13,036	5.50%	7.50%	8.27%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

There was not a 1% slippage based upon the numbers above. However, GaDOE has explored assessment results which indicated that the results remain highly unstable. Georgia's students with disabilities demonstrated improved results at the Grade 4 and Grade HS levels above. The number of students participating in the evaluation were dramatically increased by approximately 30 percentage points from the prior year. Unfortunately, the instructional impact of COVID from the prior two years was very pronounced in the assessment proficiency indicators. A review of proficiency of the most populous LEAs comprising well over 50% of the school population yielded mixed results. For example, Fayette County, Fulton County, and Forsyth County were at or above the target. Gwinnett County, Marietta City, Atlanta Public Schools, Douglas County, Cherokee County, and Clayton County were below the target. Results for the more rural regions of the state were generally weaker and well over 80% failed to meet the target. The assessment followed the first full year back in school following COVID and reflected erratic performance patterns. Hopefully, trends in student achievement will stabilize in the next year's administration.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2021 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	3,336	16,186	18.93%	20.93%	20.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	1,679	17,000	7.91%	9.91%	9.88%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	1,620	17,220	5.69%	7.69%	9.41%	Met target	No Slippage

### **Regulatory Information**

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

### **Public Reporting Information**

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

Data is available at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Assessment results were impacted by COVID 19 and reflect the first full year of in-person instruction since the pandemic. In recognition of the extensive needs of students following the pandemic, the Division for Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) implemented or continued a number of initiatives targeting students with disabilities designed to improve student outcomes and aid in teacher retention. An extensive implementation of Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)) and continuation of initiatives such as the School Completion Toolkit (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>) were in place to support the learning recovery of students with disabilities. The nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>) with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families. Georgia's DSESS also recognized the need to support school level administrators in meeting the needs of students with disabilities and implemented the School Based Administrators Academy (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Sp-Ed-and-School-Based-Admins.aspx>). Georgia is, and has been, implementing numerous robust strategies, programs, and supports to address learning recoupment for all Georgia's students, especially students with disabilities. The results of these efforts will require time to show an impact in assessment results.

### **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3B - OSEP Response**

### **3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	66.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	82.77%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	72.19%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	58.98%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	66.52%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	66.40%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	66.00%	68.00%	68.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	82.77%	84.77%	84.77%	86.77%	86.77%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	72.19%	74.19%	74.19%	76.19%	76.19%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	58.98%	60.98%	60.98%	62.98%	62.98%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	66.52%	68.52%	68.52%	70.52%	70.52%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	66.40%	68.40%	68.40%	70.40%	70.40%

## **Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

## **FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

### **Data Source:**

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

### **Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,623	1,898	1,574
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1,055	1,606	1,103

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,619	1,886	1,566
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	907	1,261	1,113

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,055	1,623	66.00%	66.00%	65.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,606	1,898	82.77%	82.77%	84.62%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,103	1,574	72.19%	72.19%	70.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

There was slippage in Grade HS (Group C) in the area of Reading/English Language Arts. A review of the results indicated that the assessment results remain highly unstable. Results for Group C were lower in the most populous metro areas of the state which account for well over 50% of the state's school population. The results in rural areas of the state were generally in alignment with the target. Hopefully, trends in student achievement will stabilize in the next year's administration.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	907	1,619	58.98%	58.98%	56.02%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,261	1,886	66.52%	66.52%	66.86%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,113	1,566	66.40%	66.40%	71.07%	Met target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

<https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

There was slippage in Grade 4 (Group A) in the area of Math. A review of the results indicated that the assessment results remain highly unstable. Results for Group A were lower in the most populous metro areas of the state which account for well over 50% of the state's school population. The results in rural areas of the state were generally in alignment with the target. Hopefully, trends in student achievement will stabilize in the next year's administration.

Assessment results were impacted by COVID 19 and reflect the first full year of in-person instruction since the pandemic. In recognition of the extensive needs of students following the pandemic, the Division for Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) implemented or continued a number of initiatives targeting students with disabilities designed to improve student outcomes and aid in teacher retention. An extensive implementation of Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)) and continuation of initiatives such as the School Completion Toolkit (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>) were in place to support the learning recovery of students with disabilities. The nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>) with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families. Georgia's DSESS also recognized the need to support school level administrators in meeting the needs of students with disabilities and implemented the School Administrators Academy (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Sp-Ed-and-School-Based-Admins.aspx>). Georgia is, and has been, implementing numerous robust strategies, programs, and supports to address learning recoupment for all Georgia's students, especially students with disabilities. The results of these efforts will require time to show an impact in assessment results.

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	23.89
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	32.01
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	24.16
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	24.22
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	24.01
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	15.96

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	21.89	19.89	17.89	15.89	13.89
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	30.01	28.01	26.01	24.01	22.01
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	22.16	20.16	18.16	16.16	14.16
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.22	20.22	18.22	16.22	14.22
Math	B <=	Grade 8	22.01	20.01	18.01	16.01	14.01
Math	C <=	Grade HS	13.96	11.96	9.96	7.96	5.96

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR

Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

There was considerable discussion with stakeholders about the possibility of requesting new baselines in Indicator 3D if the data stabilized with the 2021-2022 administration of the Georgia Milestones assessment. Stakeholders and the DSESS were hopeful that results would reflect some trend stability and improvement necessitating a request for new baselines. Unfortunately, neither of those conditions materialized and no new baselines or targets were requested.

## FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

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

### Date:

04/05/2023

### Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
-------	---------	---------	----------

a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	123,225	134,144	125,676
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,221	17,098	13,036
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	43,637	51,881	50,581
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,923	2,662	2,754
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,379	589	262
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	814	865	816

**Data Source:**

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

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	123,043	133,556	134,349
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	16,186	17,000	17,220
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	49,369	45,776	41,562
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,845	2,932	2,996
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,770	609	425
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,566	1,070	1,195

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13.52%	37.78%	23.89	21.89	24.27	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.50%	40.66%	32.01	30.01	32.16	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.27%	42.44%	24.16	22.16	34.17	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

There was slippage in Grade HS Group C in the area of Reading/English Language Arts. A review of the results indicated that the assessment results remain highly unstable. The number of students participating in the evaluation were dramatically increased. Unfortunately, there are no clear trends in the data based on this administration of the assessment. The assessment followed the first full year back in school following COVID and reflect erratic performance patterns. Hopefully, trends in student achievement will stabilize in the next year's administration. Unfortunately, the gaps between the performance of SWD and the ALL-students groups have expanded.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20.61%	44.06%	24.22	22.22	23.45	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.88%	36.47%	24.01	22.01	26.59	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	9.41%	33.17%	15.96	13.96	23.76	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

There was slippage in Grade 8 Group B in the area of Math. A review of the results indicated that the assessment results remain highly unstable. The number of students participating in the evaluation were dramatically increased. Unfortunately, there are no clear trends in the data based on this administration of the assessment. The assessment followed the first full year back in school following COVID and reflect erratic performance patterns. Hopefully, trends in student achievement will stabilize in the next year's administration. Unfortunately, the gaps between the performance of SWD and the ALL-students groups have expanded.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

There was slippage in Grade HS Group C in the area of Math. A review of the results indicated that the assessment results remain highly unstable. The number of students participating in the evaluation were dramatically increased. Unfortunately, there are no clear trends in the data based on this administration of the assessment. The assessment followed the first full year back in school following COVID and reflect erratic performance patterns. Hopefully, trends in student achievement will stabilize in the next year's administration. Unfortunately, the gaps between the performance of SWD and the ALL-students groups have expanded.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Assessment results can be located at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

Assessment results were impacted by COVID 19 and reflect the first full year of in-person instruction since the pandemic. In recognition of the extensive needs of students following the pandemic, the Division for Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) implemented or continued a number of initiatives targeting students with disabilities designed to improve student outcomes and aid in teacher retention. An extensive implementation of Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)) and continuation of initiatives such as the School Completion Toolkit (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>) were in place to support the learning recovery of students with disabilities. The nationally recognized Georgia Teacher Provider Retention Program (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>) with a grant of \$500,000 per year provided support in the areas of assuring teachers have the necessary skills, knowledge, and support to effectively serve children with disabilities and their families. Georgia's DSESS also recognized the need to support school level administrators in meeting the needs of students with disabilities and implemented the School Administrators Academy (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Sp-Ed-and-School-Based-Admins.aspx>). Georgia is, and has been, implementing numerous robust strategies, programs, and supports to address learning recoupment for all Georgia's students, especially students with disabilities. The results of these efforts will require time to show an impact in assessment results.

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

**3D - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	18.52%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	17.50%	16.50%	15.50%	15.50%	35.71%
Data	18.52%	57.14%	11.76%	35.71%	71.43%

## Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	30.21%	27.21%	24.21%	21.21%	18.21%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

220

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	3	71.43%	30.21%	33.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Georgia defines significant discrepancy as the percentage of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in comparison to the state rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. The minimum cell size is  $\geq 10$  students with disabilities with expulsion or Out of School Suspension (OSS)  $>10$  days in the LEA, and the minimum n size is  $\geq 30$  students with disabilities cumulatively enrolled in the LEA. The formula used is the Rate Ratio = (LEA SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS  $> 10$  Days)/(State SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS  $> 10$  Days). The LEA threshold score is a rate ratio of  $\geq 2.0$  for 2 consecutive years.

Methodology: The percentage of LEAs with a significant discrepancy was determined including only LEAs that had  $\geq 10$  students with disabilities with Expulsion or Out of School Suspension (OSS)  $>10$  days (cell size) and at least 30 children with disabilities cumulatively enrolled (n size). There were 3 LEAs that met both criteria. Of the 3 LEAs included for analysis, there was 1 that met the rate ratio of  $\geq 2.0$  for two consecutive years.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Georgia's data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID as discipline data is lag data. In the 2020-2021 school year suspension rates were dramatically decreased, greater than 70 percent, because virtual instruction continued to be intermittently used throughout the state. The number of LEAs included in this analysis based upon the minimum n and cell sizes is the smallest number reflected in many years. Georgia is aware that the methodology used in the significant discrepancy calculation cannot prohibit the analysis of a reasonable number of LEAs. Georgia has typically averaged 10 to 15 LEAs reviewed based upon the calculation. Data analysis for the 2021-2022 school year indicates that the number of suspensions has increased with the return to in-person instruction. As the 2020-2021 data was highly depressed and atypical, Georgia will closely monitor discipline data and its interaction with the current discrepancy determination methodology in consultation with stakeholders to determine if changes are needed.

Georgia recognizes the importance of Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality to student outcomes and conducts analysis of all LEAs for Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality, even LEAs that do not meet the minimum cell ( $< 10$ ) and n size ( $< 30$ ). LEAs that do not meet the parameters for the calculation are not included in the calculations for SPP/APR and Significant Disproportionality reported to OSEP. The purpose of the additional analysis is to provide ongoing information to all LEAs to enable LEAs to monitor their current and longitudinal Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality status. Each LEA is provided with their current status on all areas of Significant Discrepancy and Disproportionality in a Disproportionality Application located in the secured Special Education Applications platform. LEA users must be provisioned to access the platform. The Disproportionality Application provides both current and longitudinal data for Significant Disproportionality and SPP/APR Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10. There are 10 tabs within the Disproportionality Application for Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10 and all areas of Significant Disproportionality including Identification, Placement, and Discipline (i.e., Total Removals,  $> 10$  days ISS,  $> 10$  days OSS,  $\leq 10$  days ISS,  $\leq 10$  days OSS). Each tab within the application provides the calculation measures and parameters of the calculation (i.e., for 4A, the rate ratio of  $= 2.0$  for 2 consecutive years is displayed). The tab also provides the LEA's current and longitudinal rate ratio or risk ratio calculations (i.e., current and two prior years of rate ratio for the entire LEA on 4A and a disaggregation by race/ethnicity on 4B). A series of color-coded banners are also used on the front facing tile of the Disproportionality Application as well as inside the Application. The color banner schematic is: Blue – LEA's Rate Ratio is  $\geq 2.0$ , but there are no consequences for LEA because there were  $< 10$  (cell) or  $< 30$  students (n size) to meet the minimum cell and n size. Yellow – LEA's Rate Ratio is  $\geq 2.0$ , and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, but there are no consequences because this is the first year and two years are required for Significant Discrepancy. Red – LEA's Rate Ratio is  $\geq 2.0$ , and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, there are consequences for the LEA because this is the second consecutive year.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Georgia used a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to review the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy participated in the Comprehensive Compliance Review process and submitted required documents and communicated with GaDOE through the secured Special Education Applications Dashboard located in the GaDOE portal. The review included topics such as the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As an example, the State reviewed documentation to determine the following:

- o if students removed greater than ten days were able to continue to receive services
- o if the local school system conducted a manifestation determination meeting to determine if the behavior was the result of the disability; and
- o if the student has benefited from a behavior intervention plan, which includes positive behavioral interventions and supports.

As a first step of the review, LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy reviewed their policies, practices, and procedures through the use of a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Discipline at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>. LEAs completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance to the legal requirements of discipline for students with disabilities. In the first part of the Self-

Rating, LEAs were provided with directions and the number of files (10) to be submitted for data review.

In Section 2 of the Self-Rating LEAs evaluated legal adherence to discipline rules for students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) "The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are compliant with the Discipline Rule," b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Discipline Rule." Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to LEAs. LEAs had to provide evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. LEAs uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, and practices for the discipline of students with disabilities and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of disciplinary components (i.e., evidence of who is responsible for monitoring school data and when and how often it is done, evidence that PL implementation is monitored).

In section 3 LEAs were provided a listing of all required student file elements for the review: 1. Discipline records 2. Discipline meeting minutes 3. Parental notification for change in placement 4. Current IEP, current Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), if applicable 5. Evidence that Functional Behavioral Assessment and/or BIP were reviewed and/or updated 6. All Manifestation Determination Reviews with supporting evidence for team decision 7. Evidence parents were provided Procedural Safeguards 8. Evidence of services provided to the student during subsequent days of removal beyond 10 days, if applicable. In section 3 LEAs rated each file submitted using Yes, No, or N/A for items such as: a) The LEA submitted documentation that parents were notified of each Manifestation Determination Review(MDR)/IEP team meeting, if applicable. Each MDR from the current school year, must be uploaded. b) The IEP team documented a written statement within the IEP that addresses the behavioral needs for a child whose behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others.

In section 4 LEAs were required to answer 7 additional questions for the files selected:

- 1) Does the student's IEP include behavior goals?
- 2) Does the student have a BIP including positive behavioral interventions and supports?
- 3) Did the IEP team review and revise the IEP to address student behavior and concerns surrounding ISS (In-School Suspension), OSS (Out-Of-School Suspension) and/or behavior referrals?
- 4) How many OSS days were accumulated for the 2020-2021 school year?
- 5) How many days ISS were accumulated for the 2020-2021 school year?
- 6) Did the "removal" constitute a change of placement based upon the Discipline Rule?
- 7) In the occurrence of ISS, which of the following took place? The student: a) was afforded the opportunity to continue to appropriately participate in the general curriculum. b) continued to receive the services specified in his/her IEP. c) continued to participate with nondisabled children to the extent he/she would have in his/her current placement. d) None of the above

The final section of the Self-Rating required LEAs to respond to a series of discussion questions such as:

- 1) Are there groups, settings, or schools disproportionately impacted by removals? What could be contributing to these gaps?
- 2) What interventions and supports appear to be most effective? What data was reviewed to support your findings?

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy resulting in noncompliance in the regulatory requirements. The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

#### 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 4A - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP recognizes the State reported, "Georgia's data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID as discipline data is lag data. In the 2020-2021 school year suspension rates were dramatically decreased, greater than 70 percent, because virtual instruction continued to be intermittently used throughout the state. The number of LEAs included in this analysis based upon the minimum n and cell sizes is the smallest number reflected in many years." OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

#### **4A - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	5.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	5.00%	18.18%	15.38%	28.57%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

221

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	2	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Georgia defines significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity as the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs by race/ethnicity in comparison to the state rate for all SWD with > expulsion or suspension of > 10 days. The LEA minimum cell size is  $\geq 10$  students with disabilities with Expulsion or Suspension of Out of School (OSS) >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic group in the LEA, and the LEA minimum n size is  $\geq 30$  students with disabilities in the same specific racial/ethnic group cumulatively enrolled in the LEA. The formula used is the Rate Ratio (LEA SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS by race/ethnicity > 10 Days)/(State SWD Rate for Expulsion or OSS > 10 Days). The LEA threshold score is a rate ratio of  $\geq 2.0$  for 2 consecutive years.

Methodology: The number of LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity was determined using only LEAs that had both one subgroup  $\geq 10$  students with disabilities with expulsion or suspension Out of School (OSS) >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic subgroup (cell size) and the 30 children with disabilities in the same ethnic or racial subgroup cumulatively enrolled in the LEA. There were 2 LEAs that met the criteria and comprised the number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size. Of the 2 LEAs meeting the minimum cell and n size, 2 met the rate ratio of  $\geq 2.0$  for two consecutive years and were classified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Georgia's data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID as discipline data is lag data. In the 2020-2021 school year suspension rates were dramatically decreased, greater than 70 percent, because virtual instruction continued to be intermittently used throughout the state. The number of LEAs included in this analysis based upon the minimum n and cell sizes is the smallest number reflected in many years. Georgia is aware that the methodology used in the significant discrepancy calculation cannot prohibit the analysis of a reasonable number of LEAs. Georgia has typically averaged 10 to 15 LEAs reviewed based upon the calculation. Data analysis for the 2021-2022 school year indicates that the number of suspensions has increased with the return to in-person instruction. As the 2020-2021 data was highly depressed and atypical, Georgia will closely monitor discipline data and its interaction with the current discrepancy determination methodology in consultation with stakeholders to determine if changes are needed.

Georgia recognizes the importance of Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality to student outcomes and conducts analysis of all LEAs for Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality, even LEAs that do not meet the minimum cell (< 10) and n size (< 30). LEAs that do not meet the parameters for the calculation are not included in the calculations for SPP/APR and Significant Disproportionality reported to OSEP. The purpose of the additional analysis is to provide ongoing information to all LEAs to enable LEAs to monitor their current and longitudinal Significant Discrepancy and Significant Disproportionality status. Each LEA is provided with their current status on all areas of Significant Discrepancy and Disproportionality in a Disproportionality Application located in the secured Special Education Applications platform. LEA users must be provisioned to

access the platform. The Disproportionality Application provides both current and longitudinal data for Significant Disproportionality and SPP/APR Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10. There are 10 tabs within the Disproportionality Application for Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, and 10 and all areas of Significant Disproportionality including Identification, Placement, and Discipline (i.e., Total Removals, > 10 days ISS, > 10 days OSS, <= 10 days ISS, <= 10 days OSS). Each tab within the application provides the calculation measures and parameters of the calculation (i.e., for 4A, the rate ratio of = 2.0 for 2 consecutive years is displayed). The tab also provides the LEA's current and longitudinal rate ratio or risk ratio calculations (i.e., current and two prior years of rate ratio for the entire LEA on 4A and a disaggregation by race/ethnicity on 4B). A series of color-coded banners are also used on the front facing tile of the Disproportionality Application as well as inside the Application. The color banner schematic is: Blue – LEA's Rate Ratio is >= 2.0, but there are no consequences for LEA because there were < 10 (cell) or < 30 students (n size) to meet the minimum cell and n size. Yellow – LEA's Rate Ratio is >= 2.0, and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, but there are no consequences because this is the first year and two years are required for Significant Discrepancy. Red – LEA's Rate Ratio is >= 2.0, and the cell size = 10 and n size = 30 were met, there are consequences for the LEA because this is the second consecutive year.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Georgia used a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to review the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy participated in the Comprehensive Compliance Review process and submitted required documents and communicated with GaDOE through the secured Special Education Applications Dashboard located in the GaDOE portal. The review included topics such as the implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As an example, the State reviewed documentation to determine the following:

- o if students removed greater than ten days were able to continue to receive services
- o if the local school system conducted a manifestation determination meeting to determine if the behavior was the result of the disability; and
- o if the student has benefited from a behavior intervention plan, which includes positive behavioral interventions and supports.

As a first step of the review, LEAs identified as having significant discrepancy reviewed their policies, practices, and procedures through the use of a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Discipline at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>. LEAs completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance to the legal requirements of discipline for students with disabilities. In the first part of the Self-Rating, LEAs were provided with directions and the number of files (10) to be submitted for data review.

In Section 2 of the Self-Rating LEAs evaluated legal adherence to discipline rules for students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as:

- a) "The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are compliant with the Discipline Rule," b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Discipline Rule." Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to LEAs. LEAs had to provide evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. LEAs uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, for the discipline of students with disabilities and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of disciplinary components (i.e., evidence of who is responsible for monitoring school data and when and how often it is done, evidence that PL implementation is monitored).

In section 3 LEAs were provided a listing of all required student file elements for the review: 1. Discipline records 2. Discipline meeting minutes 3. Parental notification for change in placement 4. Current IEP, current Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP), if applicable 5. Evidence that Functional Behavioral Assessment and/or BIP were reviewed and/or updated 6. All Manifestation Determination Reviews with supporting evidence for team decision 7. Evidence parents were provided Procedural Safeguards 8. Evidence of services provided to the student during subsequent days of removal beyond 10 days, if applicable. In section 3 LEAs rated each file submitted using Yes, No, or N/A for items such as: a) The LEA submitted documentation that parents were notified of each Manifestation Determination Review/IEP team meeting, if applicable. Each MDR from the current school year, must be uploaded. b) The IEP team documented a written statement within the IEP that addresses the behavioral needs for a child whose behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others.

In section 4 LEAs were required to answer 7 additional questions for the file selection:

- 1) Does the student's IEP include behavior goals?
- 2) Does the student have a BIP including positive behavioral interventions and supports?
- 3) Did the IEP team review and revise the IEP to address student behavior and concerns surrounding ISS, OSS and/or behavior referrals?
- 4) How many OSS days were accumulated for the 2020-2021 school year?
- 5) How many days ISS were accumulated for the 2020-2021 school year?
- 6) Did the "removal" constitute a change of placement based upon the Discipline Rule?
- 7) In the occurrence of ISS, which of the following took place? The student: a) was afforded the opportunity to continue to appropriately participate in the general curriculum. b) continued to receive the services specified in his/her IEP. c) continued to participate with nondisabled children to the extent he/she would have in his/her current placement. d) None of the above

The concluding section of the Self-Rating required LEAs to respond to a series of discussion questions such as:

- 1) Are there groups, settings, or schools disproportionately impacted by removals? What could be contributing to these gaps?
- 2) What interventions and supports appear to be most effective? What data was reviewed to support your findings?

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the significant discrepancy resulting in noncompliance in the regulatory requirements. The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included a very low percentage of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP recognizes the State reported, "Georgia's data for this indicator was significantly impacted by COVID as discipline data is lag data. In the 2020-2021 school year suspension rates were dramatically decreased, greater than 70 percent, because virtual instruction continued to be intermittently used throughout the state." OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

**4B- Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements}}{\text{total \# of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs}}\right] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2019	Target >=	65.30%	65.40%	65.50%		62.73%
A	62.73%	Data	64.46%	64.06%	63.04%	62.73%	62.41%
B	2019	Target <=	14.20%	14.10%	14.00%		16.58%
B	16.58%	Data	15.11%	15.20%	16.26%	16.58%	17.17%
C	2019	Target <=	1.60%	1.50%	1.38%		1.48%
C	1.48%	Data	1.97%	1.77%	1.54%	1.48%	1.43%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	63.73%	64.73%	65.73%	66.73%	67.73%
Target B <=	16.58%	16.08%	15.58%	15.08%	15.08%
Target C <=	1.48%	1.38%	1.38%	1.28%	1.28%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors

- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	214,734
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	132,623
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	37,292
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2,219

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	275
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	516

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	132,623	214,734	62.41%	63.73%	61.76%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	37,292	214,734	17.17%	16.58%	17.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,010	214,734	1.43%	1.48%	1.40%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	46.20%	46.40%	46.60%		32.54%
A	Data	42.95%	41.94%	41.76%	32.54%	29.36%
B	Target <=	23.50%	23.00%	22.50%		41.32%
B	Data	25.82%	27.44%	29.26%	41.32%	42.08%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors

- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\),-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP),-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

## Targets

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

### Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	32.54%
B	2019	41.32%
C	2020	1.63%

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	32.54%	33.54%	34.54%	35.54%	37.54%
Target B <=	41.32%	40.32%	39.32%	38.32%	37.32%

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.63%	1.53%	1.53%	1.43%	1.33%

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,106	5,157	1,055	9,318
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	585	1,610	439	2,634
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,615	2,169	367	4,151
b2. Number of children attending separate school	2	16	2	20
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	0	0	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	54	40	13	107

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,634	9,318	29.36%	32.54%	28.27%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,172	9,318	42.08%	41.32%	44.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	107	9,318	1.63%	1.63%	1.15%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

The availability of general education settings is the key factor. Georgia does not have universal preschool for 3 and 4-year-old children and many community options (i.e., daycare centers, community pre-k) have been slow to reopen following COVID. LEAs were challenged to find a regular early childhood program settings for young children, especially those who were 3-years old.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

While the number of students served in Group A has decreased, the number of students served in Group B have increased. With a lack of regular early childhood programming, LEAs in Georgia have bridged the gap in programming with special education programming provided to students in small group special education settings increasing the number of students in Group B. Due to a lack of universal preschool, Georgia has large rural areas that do not

have regular preschool programming for students. As a result, LEAs have developed small classroom programs to address the needs of students with disabilities in the 3- and 4-year-old range.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID continued to impact the data for Indicator 6A. Community daycare centers closed during COVID have not returned to pre-COVID levels which limits the range of regular early childhood settings.

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by ((the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2008	Target >=	78.50%	78.60%	78.60%	80.00%	81.00%
A1	68.70%	Data	78.46%	79.75%	80.53%	80.52%	85.40%

A2	2008	Target >=	61.70%	61.80%	62.00%	62.00%	63.00%
A2	57.10%	Data	64.30%	62.01%	62.16%	54.86%	55.06%
B1	2008	Target >=	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%	82.00%	83.00%
B1	63.90%	Data	82.49%	82.58%	83.38%	82.16%	87.98%
B2	2008	Target >=	37.10%	37.20%	37.30%	45.00%	46.00%
B2	24.90%	Data	48.62%	47.44%	48.08%	44.34%	47.93%
C1	2008	Target >=	77.90%	78.00%	78.00%	80.00%	81.00%
C1	71.20%	Data	78.55%	79.74%	80.56%	80.08%	86.48%
C2	2008	Target >=	71.90%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
C2	65.70%	Data	81.58%	71.04%	71.60%	65.01%	64.68%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
Target A2 >=	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%
Target B2 >=	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%
Target C1 >=	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
Target C2 >=	72.00%	72.10%	72.20%	72.20%	72.30%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was

also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

6,887

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	86	1.25%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	821	11.92%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,464	35.78%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,919	27.86%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,597	23.19%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,383	5,290	85.40%	82.00%	82.85%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,516	6,887	55.06%	64.00%	51.05%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	104	1.51%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	786	11.41%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,913	42.30%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,282	33.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	802	11.65%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	5,195	6,085	87.98%	84.00%	85.37%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,084	6,887	47.93%	47.00%	44.78%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	91	1.32%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	659	9.57%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,755	25.48%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,346	34.06%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,036	29.56%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,101	4,851	86.48%	82.00%	84.54%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6	4,382	6,887	64.68%	72.00%	63.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> <i>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>							

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Preschool students are making progress as evidenced by meeting improvement targets for A1, B1, and C1. Unfortunately, the level of gain was not equivalent to meeting age expectations upon exit. The lack of stability and availability of preschool settings throughout the past two years as a result of COVID has adversely impacted the level of improvement of functioning in children who are now exiting preschool.
B2	Preschool students are making progress as evidenced by meeting improvement targets for A1, B1, and C1. Unfortunately, the level of gain was not equivalent to meeting age expectations upon exit. The lack of stability and availability of preschool settings throughout the past two years as a result of COVID has adversely impacted the level of improvement of functioning in children who are now exiting preschool.
C2	Preschool students are making progress as evidenced by meeting improvement targets for A1, B1, and C1. Unfortunately, the level of gain was not equivalent to meeting age expectations upon exit. The lack of stability and availability of preschool settings throughout the past two years as a result of COVID has adversely impacted the level of improvement of functioning in children who are now exiting preschool.

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Data for Indicator 7 are collected at the student level by each LEA that provides special education services to young children. No statewide assessment exists for young children (ages 3, 4, and 5 in PK). Therefore, LEAs collect this data using tools such as checklists, observation tools and standardized assessments. LEAs were asked to provide the names of the assessments utilized and reported the following: Formal: Developmental Profile 4 (DP-4), Test of Early Language Development-Fourth Edition (TELD-4), Clinical Assessment of Articulation and Phonology-Second Edition (CAAP-2), Developmental Assessment of Young Children-Second Edition (DAYC-2), Preschool Language Scale-Fifth Edition (PLS-5), Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation-Third Edition (GFTA-3), Fluharty-2, Battelle Developmental Inventory-Second Edition (BDI-2), Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales II, PALS, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Fifth Edition (PPVT-5), Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand (DASH), Brigance Early Childhood Screening, Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP), Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test -Fourth Edition (EOWPVT-4) and Receptive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test – Fourth Edition (ROWPVT-4). Informal: Teacher Checklist, Speech-language Samples, Teacher Reports, Childhood History, Behavior Checklist, and Tier information.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The lack of stability and availability of preschool settings throughout the past two years as a result of COVID has adversely impacted the level of improvement of functioning in children who are now exiting preschool.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiansights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center

- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	88.50%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%		88.60%
Data	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%	88.50%	90.21%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	88.60%	88.60%	89.60%	90.60%	91.60%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
30,000	34,502	90.21%	88.60%	86.95%	Did not meet target	Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Georgia had slippage from the prior year due to increased variability in response satisfaction and increased participation in the survey of almost 500 participants. The satisfaction rate reached an all-time high last year with a 90.21% satisfaction rate for involvement and decreased to a rate of 86.95%

this year. The representativeness of the parents responding to the survey was in greater alignment with the demographics of students with disabilities served within the state of Georgia.

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

During the 2021-2022 school year, Georgia used an online survey to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirements. All families of children with disabilities had the opportunity to participate in the survey, including parents of preschool students. Parents were all offered the same survey regardless of the grade level of the student allowing the analysis procedures to be valid and reliable. Paper copies were also available upon request. The survey was also available online in Spanish. The survey is available for participation online to all parents of children with disabilities age 3-21 in Georgia beginning in January each year and ending May 31st each year. The survey is publicized by each school system and the GaDOE so that all parents of children with disabilities including parents of children in preschool may respond to the survey. The data from the parents of preschool children is included with the data reported for all parent responses.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

224,052

**Percentage of respondent parents**

15.40%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	15.31%	15.40%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The response rate in Georgia for FFY 2021 has increased from the FFY 2020 response rate. The trend has been increasing with 34,502 respondents out of 224,052 possible respondents (based on the October 1 Child Count). The State will continue to conduct webinars, provide training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, and provide information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation. Data will also be shared with Parent to Parent, Georgia's OSEP funded parent organization. Training from the GaDOE will focus on the importance of high participation and use of the parent survey. Strategies will be shared to encourage high participation and participation representative of the student enrollment. Strategies to address underrepresented groups include providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school. School systems will be able, through the state's portal, to analyze real time survey response data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation to ensure response data is more representative of the demographics of the population. School systems will be encouraged to share participation data with principals during the data collection process to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful school systems with neighboring school systems that struggle with low participation rates. Our State's Parent training and Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizes the survey and assists parents with questions regarding their participation. Starting in the 2019-2020 school year, additional technical assistance for families was provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. In an effort to reach the historically underrepresented Hispanic subgroup a Spanish version of the survey was available in the online and paper format.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

An analysis metric of +/- 5 percentage points between racial/ethnic representation and age (grade) representation of the Parent Survey respondents and the representation of SWD served based on the Federal Child Count was used. The analysis of the response rates indicated that response rates were remarkably comparable to the rates of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity and age (grade) represented in the Federal Child Count with two exceptions. The parents of the White SWD subgroup demonstrated a +10.08 rate of response (48.08%) relative to the representation of the White subgroup (38%) in the Federal Child Count. The parents of the Black/African American SWD subgroup demonstrated a -5.89 rate of response (33.01%) relative to the representation of the Black/African American subgroup (38.9%) in the Federal Child Count. Although the Hispanic subgroup did not meet the +/- 5 percentage points criteria, with a discrepancy of -4.82 in survey respondents, parental responses for this subgroup were also considered in the nonresponse bias analysis. Georgia has made significant efforts to reach out to the Hispanic subgroup which has improved representativeness. However, since this subgroup was very close to -5.00 percentage points criteria it was prudent to evaluate the possibility of nonresponse bias in the Hispanic subgroup.

In order to determine if nonresponse bias could be significantly impacting the results of the Survey, we considered both the extent to which any subgroups were under or overrepresented in our survey along with the extent to which these subgroups differed in the outcome of interest in our survey, Parent Satisfaction. Based on the state's threshold for representativeness, our response data were representative with respect to student age (grade) but not representative with respect to certain student race/ethnicity subgroups (described more thoroughly in the prompts below). Therefore, we assessed for nonresponse bias by disaggregating the overall Survey results and attaining a Parent Satisfaction score for the White, Black/African American, and Hispanic subgroups.

The disaggregated results of the Survey did not vary by more than +/- 5% percentage points from the overall Survey results for the racial/ethnic groups having either under or over representation. Further, none of the three subgroups analyzed differed by +/- 5 percentage points in their respective Survey mean Parent Satisfaction scores. Thus, our overall survey results did not appear to have issues with nonresponse bias with respect to student race/ethnicity based on this initial examination.

The methodology for attaining the overall Parent Satisfaction percentage was to use the Mean of the 10 items on the Parent Survey. For each survey respondent, a score was calculated by summing the response choices, which range from 1 to 6 (1 = Very Strongly Disagree/Never and 6 = Very Strongly Agree/Always) and dividing by the number of responses, thus calculating a mean score for each respondent. If the mean score was 4 or above, the respondent was determined to have a high level of satisfaction. The number of parents with a score of 4 or above is then divided by the total number of parents responding to determine the Satisfaction level, expressed as a percentage. The overall Parent Satisfaction Survey percentage was 86.95% with 30,000 of 34,502 of respondents determined to have a high level of parental satisfaction.

The White subgroup had a total of 16,587 respondents with 14, 686 having a Survey mean of 4 or higher for a Parent Satisfaction Survey percent of

88.54%, which is 1.59 percentage points above the overall 86.95 Survey results. The Hispanic subgroup had a total of 3,996 respondents with 3,534 having a Survey mean of 4 or higher for a Parent Satisfaction Survey percent of 88.44%, which is 1.49 percentage points above the overall Survey results. The Black/African American subgroup had a total of 11,388 respondents with 9,646 having a Survey mean of 4 or higher for a Parent Satisfaction Survey percent of 84.70%, which is 2.25 percentage points below the overall Survey results. Although the response rate and satisfaction score of the Black/African American subgroup did not meet the +/- 5 percentage points threshold, there is concern that the subgroup had the lowest participation and satisfaction rates. As a result, Georgia will place an emphasis on attaining increased participation from the subgroup. Georgia is adding an additional report to monitor the regional collection of parent survey results while the survey is available to examine areas of the state in which participation is lower. LEAs in these regions of the state can then be provided with additional support from the DSESS.

Georgia will continue to minimize the possibility of nonresponse bias by partnering with Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizing the survey, and assisting parents with questions regarding their participation. A Spanish version of the survey is also available in the online and paper format. Finally, an analysis of individual LEA results for participation has been completed and is being used by Parent Mentors in Georgia to increase participation at the LEA level.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Georgia examined the representativeness of the parents responding to the Parent Survey based upon the percentages of students served by race/ethnicity. In examining variance, Georgia used a band of + or - 5% percentage points in parental response rate based upon racial/ethnic representation of students receiving special education services based on the Federal Child Count. For example, if 80% of the students with disabilities are in the White subgroup based on the Federal Child Count, a representative rate of response would be 75 to 85% of survey respondents.

These data reveal that a higher percentage of the parents of White SWD responded to the survey (48.08%) compared to the percentage of White SWD enrolled (38%). This is a difference between the percent rates of +10.08. A lower percentage of the parents of Black SWD responded to the survey (33.01%) as compared to Black SWD enrolled (38.9%). This is a difference between the percent rates of -5.89. All other race/ethnicity survey participation and enrollments were within the + or - 5 percentage points. The response and enrollment rates were respectively reported as: Hispanic 11.58% and 16.4%, Asian 2.29% and 2.2%, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0.13% and 0.1%, American Indian 0.41% and 0.20%, and More than One Race 4.49% and 4.30%. Based upon the discrepancy in representativeness, a nonresponse bias analysis of results was conducted as described in the previous section. A thorough analysis of the nonresponse bias for race/ethnicity based upon the +/- 5 percentage points threshold (described in the prior section) indicated no significant impact on the overall analysis of the parent survey responses.

Georgia also completed an analysis of parent respondents based upon the grade of the student represented in the survey in comparison to the Federal Child Count with a response rate band of + or -5% per grade level. Grade was selected using the stakeholder input process. For example, if there were 3,136 respondents with students with disabilities in grade 5 for 9.09% of the total survey, the percent of students in grade 5 in the Child Count should also be 9.09% within +/- 5%, and it was with 8.11% reported. No response rates by grade were outside of the band of +/- 5%. The following represents the percent of the survey responses by grade, percent of enrollment in Child Count by grade, and the difference between the percents, respectively: Pre-K - 6.54, 4.17 (2.37), K - 7.26, 4.49 (2.77), Grade 1 - 7.75, 5.59 (2.16), Grade 2 - 8.67, 6.43 (2.24), Grade 3 - 9.08, 7.08 (2.00), Grade 4 - 8.46, 7.50 (.96), Grade 5 - 9.09, 8.11 (.98), Grade 6 - 7.53, 8.30 (-.77), Grade 7 - 7.13, 8.72 (-1.59), Grade 8 - 7.09, 8.76 (-1.67), Grade 9 - 5.98, 9.93 (-3.95), Grade 10 - 5.53, 7.85 (-2.32), Grade 11 - 4.66, 6.51 (-1.85), and Grade 12 - 5.23, 6.57 (-1.34).

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics**

The State will continue to conduct webinars, provide training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, and provide information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation. Data will also be shared with Parent to Parent, Georgia's OSEP funded parent organization. Training from the GaDOE will focus on the importance of high participation and use of the parent survey. Strategies will be shared to encourage high participation and participation representative of the student enrollment. Strategies include providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school. School systems will be able, through the state's portal, to analyze real time survey response data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation to ensure response data is more representative of the demographics of the population. School systems will be encouraged to share participation data with principals during the data collection process to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful school systems with neighboring school systems that struggle with low participation rates. Our State's Parent training and Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizes the survey and assists parents with questions regarding their participation. Starting in the 2019-2020 school year, additional technical assistance for families was provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. A Spanish version of the survey was available in the online and paper format.

Georgia has intensified efforts to increase the representativeness of survey respondents. The Georgia Department of Education and LEAs publicize the availability of the survey to all families. LEA data have been shared with each Special Education Director. SEA staff and Parent Mentors have worked and will continue to work with Special Education Directors to provide strategies for increasing participation in the survey in FFY20 across all demographic groups. SEA staff will analyze the real time data of surveys completed in the current year and contact Special Education Directors to examine their data which is available in the Special Education Dashboard by school. The demographic data are not provided to Special Education Directors to avoid identifying the parents who respond. However, the directors may view the number of responses by school and are knowledgeable about the demographic makeup of each school. The SEA staff will encourage directors to reach out to system-level and school leaders to increase awareness and importance of the survey, publicize the survey at school events, and provide technology for survey completion at events and meetings.

Georgia will place an emphasis on attaining increased participation from the Black/African American subgroup based on the current analysis. Georgia is adding an additional report to monitor the regional collection of parent survey results while the survey is available to examine areas of the state in which participation is lower. LEAs in these regions of the state with lower representative participation can then be provided with additional support from the DSESS.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Georgia used a band of + or - 5 percentage points in parental response rate discrepancy based upon racial/ethnic representation and grade of students receiving special education services. For example, if 80% of the students with disabilities are in the White subgroup, a representative rate of parent response would be 75 to 85% of survey respondents.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

### 8 - OSEP Response

### 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

12

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	215	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The State defines disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian, or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria at the LEA level: (1) Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for two consecutive years and (2) SWD Ethnic/Racial Subgroup  $\geq 10$ ,  $n \geq 30$  LEA enrollment in a Specific Ethnic/Racial Subgroup.

Georgia has a minimum cell size of  $\geq 10$  and minimum n-size of  $\geq 30$ . Only LEAs that meet both criteria are evaluated at the LEA level for disproportionality by the State and included in the Georgia number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size.

The risk ratio is calculated using a compound equation and the minimum cell and n sizes above are required. The numerator of the equation requires: (A) If  $\geq 10$  children in the LEA in a specific racial/ethnic group, such as Hispanic, in the LEA are identified as SWD, and (B)  $\geq 30$  students enrolled in the LEA are in the same racial/ethnic group as (A). If both conditions are satisfied, the group will be evaluated for risk. The denominator of the equation will either be a comparison group at the LEA level or a state comparison group. If the LEA has (C)  $\geq 10$  children in the LEA in all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) identified as students with disabilities, and (D)  $\geq 30$  or more children enrolled in the LEA in all other racial ethnic groups (not Hispanic), the LEA comparison group will be used in the calculation of the Risk Ratio. If the LEA does not meet the conditions of C and D then a state comparison group is used for the denominator with (C) the number of all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) of students identified as students with disabilities in the state, and (D) all other children in all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) in the state. The use of the state comparison group is termed the Alternate Risk Ratio.

The calculation is  $A/B$  divided by  $C/D$ , with the specific LEA numbers for each component or state numbers for  $C/D$  if applicable for the Alternate Risk Ratio. LEAs with a Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years are included in Georgia's number of LEAs with disproportionate representation.

Methodology: Only LEAs with at least 10 students with disabilities identified as students with disabilities in the same ethnic/racial group and 30 students enrolled in the same racial/ethnic category with a risk ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years are included in the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation for the State. For example, an LEA would be included if there were 15 students with disabilities in the Hispanic ethnicity subgroup, an enrollment of 500 children total in the Hispanic ethnicity subgroup, and a Risk Ratio of 3.0 for two consecutive years. There was one LEAs that had a risk ratio of  $\geq 3.0$ .

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Georgia determined disproportionate representation by first examining the data. There was one LEA with a Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years for identification as a student with disabilities receiving special education and related services in any racial/ethnic group considered to have disproportionate representation. Georgia then utilized a Comprehensive Compliance Review to examine local policies, procedures, and practices to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addressed the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation, reevaluation, and eligibility determination processes.

As a first step, the LEA identified as having disproportionate representation for identification as a student with a disability reviewed its policies, practices, and procedures through the use of a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Identification at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>. The LEA completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance of the appropriate identification of students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) “The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are in compliance with the Child Find Rule,” b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Eligibility Determination Rule.” Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to the LEA. The LEA had to provide evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. The LEA uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, for the implementation of Child Find and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets for evaluating and reevaluating students for special education. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of all components.

In the next part of the Self-Rating, the LEA completed a Student Referral Chart. The chart required the number of students referred in the prior school year, number of students found eligible, and the number of students found ineligible. Next, LEAs were required to upload a representative number of student files (based upon LEA size group) found eligible for special education in the LEA. The listing also had to include a specified number of students who were determined ineligible for special education. The minimum number of files reviewed was 10. For all files uploaded, the LEA provided the

following information: student name, gender, grade level, school, race/ethnicity, name of interventions, duration of intervention, frequency of monitoring, reason for referral, found eligible y or n, and eligibility category.

The third part of the Self-Rating was an Individual Student Records Review which required the LEAs to answer Y, N, or N/A to items for each individual file submitted which included: a) Evaluations are provided in the child's native language, b) The LEA considered exclusionary factors, lack of appropriate instruction in reading, or limited English proficiency [for eligibility determinations], c) The eligibility report documents the area(s) of disability and aligns with the state rules and regulations for the specific eligibility category.

The final portion of the Self-Rating was a Compliance Review Discussion Questions section for the team to complete. LEA responded to items such as: a) What is the composition of the LEA by race, gender? What is the composition of the LEA's students with disabilities by race, gender? b) Discuss the eligibility determination process that is being implemented in your LEA. How is your LEA implementing the process with fidelity and integrity for all eligibility categories and specifically in the area of disproportionality findings in your LEA.

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. Using this Comprehensive Compliance Review process, the LEA was not identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies, procedures, and practices.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	1.46%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	8.29%	2.90%	5.61%	3.54%	1.46%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

12

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
31	4	215	1.46%	0%	1.86%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The slippage was the result of an increase of seven LEAs meeting the numerical criteria for inappropriate identification (minimum cell and n size) in the current reporting period and an increase of one LEA that had disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification. The prior year's data (FFY 2020) reflected the impact of COVID with fewer students identified as students with disabilities and thus fewer LEAs identified. The number of LEAs identified this year was more in alignment with the pre-COVID numbers.

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

Georgia defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in the special education categories of Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impaired, Speech Language Impaired, Intellectual Disability, Autism, and Emotional Behavioral Disorders by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for two consecutive years and (2) SWD Ethnic/Racial Subgroup in one of the specified categories of special education above  $\geq 10$  (minimum cell size) and  $n \geq 30$  LEA enrollment in the same Specific Ethnic/Racial Subgroup.

Only LEAs that meet the minimum cell and n sizes above are evaluated at the LEA level for disproportionality by the State for inclusion in the Georgia number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size. There were 215 LEAs meeting the criteria.

The Risk Ratio is calculated using a compound equation and the minimum cell and n sizes above are required. The numerator of the equation requires: (A)  $\geq 10$  children in the LEA in a specific racial/ethnic group (i.e., White) in one of the specified categories of special education (i.e., Other Health Impaired), and (B) 30 or more students enrolled in the LEA are the same racial/ethnic group as (A). If both conditions are satisfied, the group will be evaluated for risk.

The denominator of the equation will either be a comparison group at the LEA level or a State comparison group.

If the LEA has:

(C)  $\geq 10$  children in the LEA in all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) identified in the specified category of disability (Other Health Impaired), and (D) 30 or more children enrolled in the LEA in all other racial ethnic groups (not White), the LEA comparison group will be used in the calculation of the Risk Ratio.

If the LEA does not meet the conditions of C and D then a state comparison group is used for the denominator with:

(C) the number of all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) of students identified in the specified category of special education (Other Health Impaired) in the State, and (D) all other children in all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) enrolled in the State. The use of the State comparison group is termed the Alternate Risk Ratio.

The calculation is A/B divided by C/D, with the specific LEA numbers for each component or state numbers for C/D if applicable for the Alternate Risk Ratio. LEAs with a Risk Ratio or Alternate Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years are included in Georgia's number of LEAs with disproportionate representation.

**Methodology:** Only LEAs with at least 10 students with disabilities identified in the same ethnic/racial group in the specific category of special education and 30 students enrolled in a specific racial/ethnic category and at the LEA level with a risk ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years are included in the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of LEAs for the State that have disproportionate representation. For example, an LEA would be included if there were 15 students in the special education category of Other Health Impaired in the White racial subgroup, an enrollment of 500 children total in the White racial subgroup, and a Risk Ratio of 4.5 for two consecutive years. There were 31 LEAs that met the threshold level with a risk ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Georgia used a Comprehensive Compliance Review process to review local policies, procedures, and practices to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices. LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation participated in the Comprehensive Compliance Review process and submitted required documents and communicated with GaDOE through the secured Special Education Applications Dashboard located in the GaDOE portal. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addressed the following areas: child find, evaluation, reevaluations, and eligibility determination processes.

As a first step, LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories reviewed their policies, practices, and procedures through the use of a GaDOE developed electronic form titled LEA Self-Rating for Disproportionality Compliance Review – Identification at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Disproportionality.aspx>. LEAs completed this document by convening a team of stakeholders to self-assess or rate their compliance of the appropriate identification of students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) “The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are in compliance with the Child Find Rule,” b) The LEA provides professional learning activities to ensure that all teachers and administrators are fully informed about their responsibilities for implementing the Eligibility Determination Rule.” Rules referenced in the protocol were all hyperlinked to provide clarity to LEAs. LEAs had to provide evidence and/or documentation to support the rating endorsed on the Self-Rating. LEAs uploaded evidence documents such as policies, procedures, for the implementation of Child Find and professional learning agendas, presentations, and sign-in sheets for evaluating and reevaluating students for special education. Ratings and evidence also had to provide evidence of the implementation and monitoring of all components. In the next part of the Self-Rating, LEAs completed a Student Referral Chart. The chart required the number of students referred in the prior school year, number of students found eligible, and the number of students found ineligible. Next, LEAs were required to upload a representative number of student files (based upon LEA size group) found eligible in the LEA for the specific area of disproportionate representation identified (i.e., Specific Learning Disability). The listing also had to include a specified number of students who were determined ineligible for special education. The minimum number of files reviewed was 10. For all files uploaded, the LEA provided the following information: student name, gender, grade level, school, race/ethnicity, name of interventions, duration of intervention, frequency of monitoring, reason for referral, found eligible y or n, and eligibility category. The third part of the Self-Rating was an Individual Student Records Review which required the LEAs to answer Y, N, or N/A to items for each individual file submitted which included: a) Evaluations are provided in the child’s native language, b) The LEA considered exclusionary factors, lack of appropriate instruction in reading, or limited English proficiency [for eligibility determinations], c) The eligibility report documents the area(s) of disability and aligns with the state rules and regulations for the specific eligibility category. The final portion of the Self-Rating was a Compliance Review Discussion Questions section for the team to complete. LEA responded to items such as: a) What is the composition of the LEA by race, gender? What is the composition of the LEA’s students with disabilities by race, gender? b) Discuss the eligibility determination process that is being implemented in your LEA. How is your LEA implementing the process with fidelity and integrity for all eligibility categories and specifically in the area of disproportionality findings in your LEA.

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. Using this Comprehensive Compliance Review process, 4 of the 31 LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies, procedures, and practices.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

COVID did impact the indicator. The number of LEAs identified this year was more in alignment with the pre-COVID numbers, which led to a slippage from the prior year. The prior year’s data (FFY 2020) reflected the impact of COVID with fewer students identified as students with disabilities and thus fewer LEAs identified.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

Three LEAs were determined to be significantly disproportionate with policies, procedures, and practices which contributed to the disproportionate representation and were not legally compliant with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646 after a review conducted by the Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and establish full implementation of regulatory requirements 34 C.F.R. § 300.646. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of prereferral, evaluation, and eligibility determination processes for special education.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The CAP was due within 45 days of notification of noncompliance.
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review which contained the Self-Report. Policies, procedures, and practices were required to be in 100% compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 1 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (prong 1 data) came into compliance.
- 6) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student eligibility reports (reports written following the initial collection of records in which noncompliance was determined). The reports were required to demonstrate evidence of 100% compliance. Additionally, the implementation of updated professional learning updated supervision and monitoring plans were required. The Prong 2 review conducted by GaDOE of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements previously cited as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 2 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 2 data came into compliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

Three LEAs were determined to be significantly disproportionate with policies, procedures, and practices which contributed to the disproportionate representation and were not legally compliant with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646 after a review conducted by the Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and establish full implementation of regulatory requirements 34 C.F.R. § 300.646. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of prereferral, evaluation, and eligibility determination processes for special education.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the appropriate identification of students with disabilities. The CAP was due within 45 days of notification of noncompliance.
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review which contained the Self-Report. Policies, procedures, and practices were required to be in 100% compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.646.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 1 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (prong 1 data) came into compliance.
- 6) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student eligibility reports (reports written following the initial collection of records in which noncompliance was determined). The reports were required to demonstrate evidence of 100% compliance. Additionally, the implementation of updated professional learning updated supervision and monitoring plans were required. The Prong 2 review conducted by GaDOE of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements previously cited as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 2 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 2 data came into compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the 3 districts identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the four (4) districts identified in FFY 2021 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).  
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.56%	97.91%	98.54%	98.80%	98.16%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
34,894	34,242	98.16%	100%	98.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

652

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

Georgia had 652 students whose evaluation was not completed within the required 60 days.

The following data describes the number of days and reasons late.

The number of students in each range of days beyond the 60-day timeline are:

Evaluation completed 1 -10 days after 60 days: 251

Evaluation completed 11-30 days after 60 days: 163

Evaluation completed 31-60 days after 60 days: 98

Evaluation completed > 60 days after 60 days: 140

The number of students for each reason for delay is shown below:

Student delay (excessive absences, withdrawal, re-enrollment): 32 (4.91%)

Parent delay (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner): 96 (14.72%)

Teacher/evaluator delay (teachers not following through, lack of psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech language pathologists): 450 (69.02)

District errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policy, and procedures): 54 (8.28%)

Other reasons such as school closure due to weather: 20 (3.07%)

Total Late: 652 (100%)

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. A date based, auto-calculation spreadsheet was provided for LEAs that opted not to use the state provided IEP platform (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY21%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/Initial%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>). The spreadsheet tracked the number of parental consents for evaluation and the number of evaluations completed on time. If evaluations were completed late (based on 60-day timeline), the number of days late and the reasons and exceptions for lateness were also collected in the spreadsheet. For LEAs that opted to use the State-Provided IEP platform, this information was generated within IEP Platform. Special Education Directors submitted the data by July 31st for the previous fiscal year. The data were submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application used to track this indicator year-to-year. The GaDOE reviewed the Child Find data of each LEA to ensure timely initial evaluations. Georgia has a 60-day requirement from receipt of consent to the completion of the evaluation. This is a compliance indicator with a target of 100% completed on time.

The GaDOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. The verification process ensures timeline data submitted are accurate. LEAs randomly selected are required to submit through the SE Applications Dashboard supporting documentation for the aggregate data that is provided to the State. LEAs are required to submit the following information for students evaluated for special education eligibility in the July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022 data collection window: name, date of receipt of parental consent for evaluation, and date of completion of evaluation. After the submission, the State requires the LEA to submit documents (i.e., parental consents, evaluations) on students selected from the LEA provided list to substantiate the reported information.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
57	41	0	16

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

There were 57 LEAs identified as having noncompliance in implementing regulatory requirements. For the LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required them to submit a narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. Prong 2 required Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations completed between July 1, 2022 through November 4, 2022 were required to be submitted through the

Dashboard Timeline Application. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation. Based on the review of new information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified 100% compliance in 41 of the 57 of the LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. There were 16 LEAs with noncompliance based upon the submission of additional data. These LEAs will continue to receive monitoring and support until they are in regulatory compliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For FFY2020, LEAs not at 100% compliant had to complete Prong 1 activities. Prong 1 required Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the Special Education Directors submitted the list of students' names reported as noncompliant and the date that the evaluation was completed. The deadline for this collection was September 23, 2022. This addressed the isolated findings of non-compliance. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation was completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each of the 513 individual records that exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

GaDOE is conducting required technical assistance with the 16 LEAs that are not in compliance and subsequent record reviews will be conducted to bring all 16 LEAs into compliance by FFY2022.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining 16 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.52%	98.98%	98.40%	98.40%	96.91%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,746
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	665

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,046
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	972
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	4
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,046	3,105	96.91%	100%	98.10%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

59

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

The number of students in each range of days beyond the child's 3rd birthday:

- 1 - 10 days: 11 students
- 11 - 30 days: 5 students
- 31 - 60 days: 6 students
- > 60 days: 37 students

The number of students whose IEP was not in place by the child's 3rd birthday by reason:

- Student delay: 1 student (1.69%)
- Parent delay: 36 students (61.01%)
- Teacher/evaluator delay: 15 students (25.42%)
- System errors: 3 students (5.08%)
- Student referred to LEA by BCW less than 90 days before 3rd birthday: 4 students (6.78%)
- Total Late: 59 (100%)

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

LEAs maintained a log of children transitioning from Part C to Part B and dates that an eligibility determination was made and IEP in place. A spreadsheet was provided for LEAs not participating in the state provided IEP platform (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY22%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/BCW%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>) which tracked the number of referrals, the number of children who have an IEP developed and in place by the third birthday, if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. For LEAs participating in the state provided IEP platform, the data was generated within the platform. Special Education Directors submitted the data on July 31, 2022 (for the July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022, window). The aggregated transition data were submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application located within the secured Special Education Applications Portal used to track this indicator year-to-year. Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities were required (see Correction of Findings of Noncompliance for more information on these processes).

The GaDOE also conducted a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. If selected, Directors uploaded child-specific data for children transitioning from Part C to Part B reported with completed evaluation, eligibility, and IEP the previous year. For example, if an LEA reported 150 evaluations/eligibilities/IEPs for young children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed, the director uploads a spreadsheet with the names, consent date, completion dates, and accompanying demographic data showing evidence that those 150 referrals were completed in a timely manner. GaDOE staff check these data against what the school system reported in the Student Record data collection.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	12	0	2

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

Georgia required that each LEA submit Early Childhood Transition timeline data by July 31, 2022. LEA reported data revealed some young children were referred to special education from Part C and found eligible but did not have an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday. These LEAs are considered noncompliant and participated in Prong 2, as well as Prong 1 monitoring, to demonstrate that they understood and implemented regulatory requirements.

Special Education Directors for the LEAs identified as having noncompliance were required to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. The LEAs submitted additional data to verify that systemic corrections and processes were in place. Prong 2 required Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations, eligibilities, and IEPs for children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed between July 1, 2022, and November 4, 2022, were required to be submitted through the Special Education Applications Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GaDOE staff reviewed the new data submitted. Based on the subsequent review of new information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified 100% compliance in 12 of the 14 LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were now correctly implementing regulatory requirements and demonstrated correction within one year of noncompliance. Two LEAs subsequently reviewed with new data were not correctly implementing regulatory requirements. The two noncompliant LEAs will continue to receive monitoring and support until they are in regulatory compliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

LEAs not at 100% compliant had to complete Prong 1 activities.

Prong 1 required Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the Special Education Directors submitted the list of students' names reported as noncompliant and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. The deadline for this collection was September 23, 2022. This addressed the isolated findings of non-compliance. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation was completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each of the 71 individual records that exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance.

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

GaDOE is conducting required technical assistance with the two LEAs that are not in compliance and subsequent record reviews will be conducted to bring both LEAs into compliance by FFY2022.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining two (2) uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	94.25%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.09%	94.25%	91.36%	91.10%	91.67%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
333	356	91.67%	100%	93.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

For FFY21, the GaDOE reviewed the transition plans of students aged 16 and over (grades 9-12) at the time of the review. The GADOE reviewed the transition plans of systems in the FFY21 Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM) Cycle. The review consisted of an evaluation of a selection of each participating CFM system’s transition plans. The number of plans reviewed was based upon the size of the reviewed system, with a minimum of 5 transition plans reviewed during the CFM process. Some small LEAs did not have 5 students aged 16 and over (grades 9-12) at the time of the review and each student meeting that criteria were included.

GaDOE also reviewed the transition plans of any LEA that participated as part of an optional additional review for their Annual Performance Report (APR) and LEA Determination for Indicator 13. When LEAs were in the CFM process and transition plans were evaluated, a percentage of compliance was determined based upon the initial selection of plans reviewed and subsequently corrected plans were not considered in the percentage. For example, if an LEA had 10 plans reviewed and 6 were compliant the percentage is 60% on the LEAs determination. The LEA was required to correct the noncompliant plans to bring them into compliance. However, the LEA remained at 60% compliance in their determination. That percentage remained in the LEA’s determination until the LEA was monitored again or elected to participate in an opt in review of transition plans. In a subsequent year, the LEA can request the selection of additional plans for review by GaDOE and receive an updated percentage of compliance based upon the later review. The updated review compliance percentage can then be used in the LEAs determination rather than the prior review’s percentage.

The transition plans were reviewed by GaDOE DSESS in the Results Driven Accountability Unit for compliance with the following transition plan indicators: postsecondary outcome goal for employment, postsecondary outcome goal for education/training, postsecondary outcome goal for independent living (if appropriate), annual transition goals that reflect steps to desired post-secondary outcome goals, postsecondary goals based upon transition assessments, transition services and/or activities to facilitate movement to postsecondary outcomes, course of study to facilitate movement to post-school outcomes, student invited to the meeting, agency representative invited (if applicable) and parental consent received prior to inviting agency representative (if applicable). For transition plans to be determined 100% compliant, each indicator in the reviewed criteria had to be met. If there were questions about any transition indicator containing the necessary elements, a second reviewer at GaDOE validated or refuted the decision. All DSESS reviewers participated in a training session for reviewing transition components prior to evaluating any transition plans. The training provided clear descriptions and examples of acceptable plan components to ensure consistency of the evaluation of plans.

An LEA was determined compliant only if all transition plan indicators on all reviewed plans were compliant. For LEAs that had transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities were required (see Correction of Findings of Noncompliance for more information on these processes). LEAs with non-compliance were required to submit additional plans to address systemic compliance. LEAs with continued non-compliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required components for secondary transition. LEAs were also provided with targeted TA on writing compliant Transition Plans.

The GaDOE calculated the percentage of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above containing each of the required components for secondary transition by dividing the number of compliant plans submitted by the total number of plans in the original submission. The GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data collected through the Special Education Applications Portal.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

**If no, please explain**

GaDOE requires that IEPs include Transition Services beginning not later than the student’s entry into ninth grade or by age 16, whichever comes first, or younger if determined appropriate by the IEP Team. The students selected for state monitoring will be at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
25	25	0	0

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

For school systems that had transition plans found to be noncompliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities were required. Prong 2 addressed the implementation of regulatory requirements. Prong 2 required the submission of additional transition plans for review. School systems with non-compliance were required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. School systems with continued non-compliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required regulatory components for secondary transition. School systems had to demonstrate 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements. GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 made any necessary changes and were now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

Prong 1 required the correction of individual noncompliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices, and procedures regarding transition planning. Each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY2020 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data (i.e., a revised transition plan) subsequently collected through the State secured data system (Special Education Applications). The state verified that for each student determined to have noncompliant transition plan(s), a new transition plan was developed, reviewed, and determined to be compliant within one year of notification of noncompliance. Numerous technical assistance and professional development opportunities were provided to the noncompliant

systems on revising individual noncompliant plans such as a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offered training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference and the Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2009	Target >=	26.25%	27.00%	27.40%	27.40%	27.40%
A	27.23%	Data	25.80%	25.95%	24.44%	25.62%	26.86%
B	2009	Target >=	53.70%	53.90%	54.00%	54.00%	55.00%
B	51.46%	Data	58.75%	59.76%	58.40%	57.78%	60.34%
C	2009	Target >=	80.00%	80.10%	80.10%	80.10%	81.00%
C	77.08%	Data	82.88%	82.92%	84.77%	83.98%	84.23%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	27.40%	27.80%	27.80%	27.80%	27.90%
Target B >=	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target C >=	82.00%	82.00%	83.00%	83.00%	84.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia’s State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22

- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	13,343
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	11,104
Response Rate	83.22%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,998
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	3,850
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	827
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	1,661

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,998	11,104	26.86%	27.40%	27.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6,848	11,104	60.34%	56.00%	61.67%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	9,336	11,104	84.23%	82.00%	84.08%	Met target	No Slippage

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	82.87%	83.22%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The effective strategies provided by GaDOE to LEAs include the following:

- 1) encouraging LEAs to have IEP case managers and/or transition specialists of exiting students collect extensive contact information to use the next year to enable contact and a follow-up on student outcomes and progress
- 2) encouraging LEAs to reach out to students using social media, such as Facebook
- 3) posting the exiters from the prior school year in February of the current school year for each LEA in Special Education Applications to enable LEAs to start reaching out to students in a timely manner
- 4) encouraging LEAs to review the listing of exiters by the student’s Georgia’s unique Testing Identifier (GTID) in the Georgia GUIDE system to be certain exiting students have not reenrolled in either their LEA or another LEA prior to census submission
- 5) encouraging LEAs to use bilingual resources and interpreters to contact students who are English Learners
- 6) LEAs work with vocational rehabilitation counselors who assist in locating exiters
- 7) providing LEAs with data regarding outcomes for exiters disaggregated by region of the state, LEA size groups, LEAs meeting on not meeting targets on this indicator which is designed to increase representativeness
- 8) soliciting feedback from the State Advisory Panel on increasing response rate

GaDOE provides extensive support to LEAs directed at encouraging response rate increase through presentations, email reminders via Email Blasts, and a guidance document (see Post-School Survey for 2020-2021 Exiters FY2022 Data Collection at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Info/FY22/FY22%20Post-School%20Outcomes%20for%202020-2021%20Exiters.pdf>).

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation and gender of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for response. The total group of exiters was 13,343 with

11,104 respondents to the Post-School Survey for an 83.22% overall participation rate.

Response analysis and nonresponse bias analysis examined response and nonresponse on the survey at the unit level (i.e., participation v. nonparticipation), not the item level. For response rate, the percentage of total survey respondents in a specific ethnic/racial group in the survey was compared to the total percentage of students who exited at the conclusion of the prior school year in the same ethnic/racial group. For example, there were 4,754 African American respondents from the total of 5,693 African American exiters yielding a participation percentage of 83.51%. Due to the small number of students surveyed in the American Indian (n=27) and Pacific Islander (n=10) subgroups these subgroups were combined into an Other (n=37) subgroup for analysis. The relative response rates and relative exiter rates for all ethnic and racial groups were within the +/-5 percentage points threshold. As a result, the entirety of the subgroup analysis was determined to be representative. Specific response rates are provided for all racial and ethnic groups in the next section.

An analysis of the Unengaged Outcome was conducted to be sure that there was no significant difference between the groups in this area. It is critical to Georgia that students with disabilities have engagement in post-school activities after exiting high school. Fortunately, all racial and ethnic groups were within the +/- 5 percentage points threshold in the area of Unengaged. The percentages reported were: Black (12.03%), Hispanic (11.67%), More than one race (11.29%), Asian (12.00%), White (11.45%), Other (16.12%) and Total (11.74%). Given the acceptably even response rates and the unengaged outcome rates by each racial group, nonresponse bias in terms of race does not seem to be an issue.

The gender analysis for response rate using the same procedure described above yielded no significant differences in either response or nonresponse. There was less than 1 percentage point difference between the response and nonresponse rates. Of the 13,343 exiters, 4,656 were female and 83.67% responded to the survey. There were 8,687 male exiters and 82.97% responded to the survey. Nonresponse rates were 16.23% for female and 17.02% for male.

Georgia is always seeking to improve response rates and examine nonresponse bias, if applicable. In order to enhance feedback from a wide range of stakeholders, the DSESS at has added a Program Specialist to support the needs of English Learner families and students. One objective of this position is enhanced communication with students and their families when language is a barrier. Georgia also utilizes a Parent Mentor Program and a close working relationship with Parent to Parent to increase feedback from a wide and diverse range of stakeholders that are representative of the students with disabilities served.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for any subgroup with a total of 30 students or more. Georgia also used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the gender representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year.

Specific response rates by ethnicity referenced in the previous section are provided in this section. Response rates are reported based upon a total of 11,104 respondents for the survey in FFY2021 based upon 13,343 total students who exited school the prior school year. Ethnic/racial groups are reported as follows: African American 4,754 respondents (83.51%) of 5,693 exiters , Hispanic 1,513 respondents (80.27%) of 1,885 exiters, Other 31 respondents (83.78%) of 37 exiters, More than One Race 343 respondents (80.71%) of 425 exiters, Asian 141 respondents (80.57%) of 175 exiters, and White 4,322 respondents (84.28%) of 5,128 exiters.

The gender analysis for response rate using the same procedure described above yielded no significant differences in either response or nonresponse. There was less than 1 percentage point difference between the response and nonresponse rates. Of the 13,343 exiters, 4,656 were female and 83.67% responded to the survey. There were 8,687 male exiters and 82.97% responded to the survey. Nonresponse rates were 16.23% for female and 17.02% for male.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for any subgroup with a total of 30 students or more. Georgia also used a range of +5 or -5 percentage points to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the gender representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2020-2021 school year.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**14 - OSEP Response**

**14 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	59
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	15

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	60.98%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	62.90%	63.00%	63.10%	63.10%	50.00%-70.00%
Data	57.83%	45.83%	60.98%	43.24%	13.04%

#### Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target (low)	FFY 2021 Target (high)	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
15	59	13.04%	50.00%	70.00%	25.42%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of resolution sessions in the current reporting year (n=59) has increased from the previous year (n=23) which indicates a return to pre-COVID levels. Georgia recognizes the need to encourage LEAs and parents to work through the resolution and mediation processes and endeavors to enhance communication through several avenues including IEP Team Meeting Facilitation (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/IEP-Facilitation.aspx> ). Located on the website are several resources such as a Parent Guide, IEP Facilitation Form, Facilitated IEP (FIEP) Promotional Flyer, and IEP Facilitation Policies Manual. There is also a helpful video to outline the process. Georgia also provides a Special Education Help Desk number (404) 656-3963 and email address SPEDHelpDesk@doe.k12.ga.us for parents with questions and concerns. Parent Engagement Specialists provide support at both contacts and support parents in working with LEAs to intervene in situations before they reach the level of needing a Resolution Session.

GaDOE has hired additional personnel in the Family Engagement and Dispute Resolution unit to provide more proactive support to LEAs. Georgia also hired an Ombudsman to provide additional support to the LEAs and families with neutrality. The Ombudsman serves as a designated neutral party who advocates for a fair process and provides confidential, informal assistance and support to parents, guardians, advocates, educators, and students with disabilities.

The number of resolution sessions that were resolved in the current period through settlement agreements (n=15) is dramatically improved from the prior reporting period (n=3).

### **15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **15 - OSEP Response**

### **15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$  divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	94
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	8
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	37

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center

- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	62.90%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	60.00%	50.00% - 70.00%	50.00% - 70.00%	50.00%-70.00%	50.00%-70.00%
Data	54.44%	63.11%	61.54%	65.88%	41.30%

#### Targets

FFY	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target (low)	FFY 2021 Target (high)	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
8	37	94	41.30%	50.00%	70.00%	47.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Georgia recognizes the need to encourage LEAs and parents to work through the resolution and mediation processes and endeavors to enhance communication through several avenues including IEP Team Meeting Facilitation (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/IEP-Facilitation.aspx> ). Located on the website are several resources such as a Parent Guide, IEP Facilitation Form, Facilitated IEP (FIEP) Promotional Flyer, and IEP Facilitation Policies Manual. There is also a helpful video to outline the process. Georgia also provides a Special Education Help Desk number (404) 656-3963 and email address SPEDHelpDesk@doe.k12.ga.us for parents with questions and concerns. Parent Engagement Specialists provide support at both contacts and support parents in working with LEAs to intervene in situations before they reach the level of needing a Resolution Session.

GaDOE has hired additional personnel in the Family Engagement and Dispute Resolution unit to provide more proactive support to LEAs. Georgia also hired an Ombudsman to provide additional support to the LEAs and families with neutrality. The Ombudsman serves as a designated neutral party who advocates for a fair process and provides confidential, informal assistance and support to parents, guardians, advocates, educators, and students with disabilities.

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

##### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

##### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,



**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Students with IEPs (age 14-21) who exit high school with a regular diploma	Students with IEPs (age 14-21) who exit high school by graduating with a regular diploma, dropping out, or receiving a certificate.	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4,781	7,153	69.68%	66.84%	66.84%	N/A	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

618 exiting data of the IDEA EDfacts file FS009 is used to calculate the annual event graduation rate.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

The data were collected from 618B SPP/APR data (FS009). The data were analyzed through calculating the Annual Event Graduation rate as described in the FS009 specifications. Specifically, the number of students with disabilities for the 50 identified LEAs who graduated with a regular diploma is divided by the number of students with disabilities who exited special education (not including students who moved known continuing, returned to regular education, or died). The State provides as part of SSIP a School Completion Toolkit that guides the 50 LEAs through a deep analysis of data and provides evidence-based tools and resources to support data analysis and interventions. The Toolkit is also publicly available for all LEAs at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/5-steps-School-Completion-Toolkit.aspx>.

The state is also requesting a reset of the baseline for the graduation rate. The decrease in the number of students included in the numerator based on the FS009 Children with Disabilities Exiting Special Education resulted in an Annual Event Graduation Rate that was not comparable to the prior Annual Event Graduation Rate (see Indicator 1 Additional Information section).

The 10 targeted LEAs and schools were further evaluated through other success measures to support the data such as the Georgia Milestones LEA and school level data, stakeholder engagement, district annual surveys, fidelity rubrics, LEA benchmarks, and coaching logs. The analysis of these measures will be described in later sections of this document.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

The State collects the following measures of success: District Team Implementation Fidelity Rubric with evidence, Evidence-based Practice Fidelity Rubric, Benchmark data on EBPs, District Annual Survey, State/Regional Technical Support Annual Survey, professional learning evaluation survey, District Plan of Support Short Term Action Plan progress data, state assessment data on academic proficiency, annual event graduation rates, district benchmark data and anecdotal data from continuous improvement team meetings.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

Assessment measures are a part of the evaluation plan for the SSIP in the 10 targeted LEAs. While Georgia largely resumed in-person learning in the 2021-2022 school year, the pervasive impact of learning loss from the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years continued to be a factor. Participation rates for assessments were considerably improved in the 2021-2022 school year and are now at pre-pandemic levels. Georgia met all six SPP/APR Indicator 3A Assessment participation targets. Participation rates for all six targets was above 95% participation. However, assessment results on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System have continued to be variable, including the results used for three key measures in the SSIP plan, which are described in a later section of the document. Georgia met only two out of six Indicator 3B Assessment proficiency targets. Georgia's results on the 3D Achievement gap targets for students with disabilities and the All-students group participating in the Georgia Milestones Assessment reflected no targets met. These results impacted the three key measures. The three key measures were: Percentage of students with disabilities in the 10 LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System, percentage of students with disabilities in target schools scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System and percentage of selected LEAs decreasing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and the All-students group. The data source for each of the above measures was the Georgia Milestones Assessment System using data from EDfacts FS175 and FS178 spring 2022 administration.

The State did work with districts to provide benchmark data on all Evidence-based practices (EBP) that were implemented for the SSIP. Data for all other key measures and the State's SiMR were available and are reported in this APR (ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT). The State did not identify any concerns regarding data validity and reliability or collection for the current reporting period. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection, the State SSIP Program Manager, SSIP Program Specialist and the collaborating partners of the Division for School and District Effectiveness worked with the 10 selected intensive SSIP/Targeted Support Improvement (TSI) districts to collect and analyze all available data related to the SSIP activities and outcomes.

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

<https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/ap/w-59584e83/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshealy.sharepoint.com%2F%3A%3A%2F%2FSSIPTeam%2FEeUq0AHQOodKtkAycG8jaqsBl3XtNzQFFnQSR26qLm3Yg%3Fe%3D9CTuzJ&data=04%7C01%7Cdkemp%40doe.k12.ga.us%7C4c9f3c94ceec49705f3508d9db50d929%7C1aa55c8303434ecbbd39bd7f43876bd7%7C0%7C0%7C637781962565162975%7CUnknown%7CTWfPbGZsb3d8eyJWljoIMC4wLjAwMDAILCJljoIV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwLiCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=Huz%2F3TNQD2lXZw2mthYcxSiBd6mvWKPakuyKrFGywyk%3D&reserved=0>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Coherent Improvement Strategy One: Provide high quality professional learning to leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

Coherent Strategy 1: "Professional Learning Georgia" The Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit facilitated the SSIP Professional Learning Series, which included the following topics tailored to meet the needs of LEAs based on surveys from the previous year: Comprehensive Special Education Improvement Process, The Administrator's Role in Supporting Co-Teaching in the Least Restrictive Environment, High Quality Co-Teaching in the Least Restrictive Environment, Integrating ELA Content for Secondary Students with Disabilities, Integrating Mathematics Content for Secondary Students with Disabilities, Positive Behavior Supports in Secondary Settings, Integrating SS Content for Secondary SWDs, Improving Graduation Rates for SWD through CTAE, The Power of Self-Determination for SWD, Master Scheduling for Special Education Part 1, The Cycle of SDI, Integrating Mathematics Content for Secondary SWD, Integrating Social Studies Content for Secondary SWD, Integrating Science content for Secondary SWD, HLP #7 & #16 Establishing a Supportive Learning Environment Utilizing Explicit Instructional Strategies, HLP #14 Utilizing Cognitive and Metacognitive Strategies to Support Memory, Attention and Self-Regulation, Fidelity of Implementation, Teaching ESOL and SWD Dually Identified Students in Secondary Settings, Positive Behavior Supports in Secondary Settings, and Integrating Accessible Educational Materials and Assistive Technology Tools with High School Completion Strategies.

Other stakeholder requested training opportunities included a WIDA Workshop for Teaching English Learners with Disabilities, a Behavior training, two Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) trainings, monthly Teacher/Provider Retention Program (TPRP) sessions, and nine trainings on AT and Accessible Materials. Also, in response to stakeholder input from the previous year, we developed the Special Education and School Administrator Academy (SESAA) to deliver a series of professional learning opportunities that make up a "Special Education 101" type series aimed at improving the special education knowledge base of school and LEA administrators. 3,572 total participants attended SSIP related professional learning: 575 attended the SSIP Professional Learning Series; 550 attended SDI trainings; 111 attended behavior trainings; 27 attended the WIDA workshop; 178 attended TPRP HLP sessions; 234 attended multi-sensory reading trainings; and 1,897 participants attended SESAA sessions. 80% of participating SSIP LEAs indicated the training was of high quality and useful to the SSIP work. 85% of attendees indicated improvement in knowledge and skills on topics, exceeding the 74% target. There were 1,148 participants in attendance in TPRP sessions conducted. Survey data gathered in these monthly sessions indicated a 90% or higher agree or strongly agree rating on the following statements: This training was of HIGH QUALITY. The training was RELEVANT to my work. The training content is USEFUL for teaching Georgia students. I gained NEW KNOWLEDGE as a result of this training. Overall, I was SATISFIED with the training, and I feel ready to use the HLP(s) taught in this training.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Two: Develop and disseminate print and digital resources to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

Coherent Strategy 2: Digital Tools and Resources Resource Guides: The School Completion Toolkit, websites for HLPs and Inclusive Leadership; guides for Distance Learning, Collaborative Planning, School Leadership Team, and Teacher Tools Newsletters and Family Engagement One Pages were created. These resource guides, listed above, were developed, and disseminated to all LEAs in Georgia. There were 4,414 page views of the School Completion Toolkit with "Select Interventions" being the most visited. LEAs reported the digital and print resources were useful, relevant, and improved knowledge and skills around graduation, student achievement and the SSIP work. The 10 targeted LEAs were also provided with data collection tools including templates to collect data on interventions such as Check and Connect, Early Warning System, and the reading intervention.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Three: Provide technical assistance including coaching to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

Coherent Strategy 3: Technical Assistance and Coaching: 324 collective support technical assistance and coaching meetings were held to support LEAs. 24% (79/324 sessions) of all technical assistance and coaching was completed with LEA effectiveness partners. The coaching focus and technical assistance was planned by both SSIP and school improvement program specialists working together. In previous reporting, collaboration defined as engagement between targeted LEAs and the GaDOE SSIP team and quantified as perception data was 23% on the Annual LEA Survey. According to the Annual LEA Survey, 100% of selected LEAs reported collective support between School and LEA Improvement (SDI) and DSESS were highly effective and provided high-quality relevant supports and resources. 100% of stakeholders surveyed agree collaboration should continue. 93% of selected LEAs/schools reported the SSIP Program Specialists were effective and provided high-quality professional learning, technical assistance and coaching that changed practices for student success. All stakeholders surveyed agree the focus of SSIP should remain on graduation but also provide professional learning for student achievement in literacy and mathematics. Other areas of need noted on the Annual LEA Survey and Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Survey were the need for additional training for building level leaders, how to engage students, assistance with recruiting and retaining special education teachers, assistance with recruiting and retaining special education teachers, teaching how to implement Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) and help with IEP implementation.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

GaDOE used the data described below to determine short term and midterm outcomes on the SSIP Evaluation Plan. The SSIP Evaluation Plan informed all evaluation activities and adjustments to implementation, including decisions regarding continued implementation of improvement strategies. Strategies are research and evidence-based and have proven to build a sustainable system. Data sources included quantitative data (attendance and academic proficiency) collected by the GaDOE, data collection tools developed by OSEP-funded TA centers (i.e., What Works Clearinghouse, Evidence for ESSA), and customized tools including surveys, checklists, rubrics, and pre/post-tests. These tools support the systems framework to promote accountability/monitoring and provide relevant professional development and technical assistance.

Coherent Improvement Strategy One: pre/post-tests, participant surveys, Annual LEA Survey and attendance records were used to assess implementation progress and outcomes. Data was collected to promote accountability and monitoring and address professional learning.

Short-Term Goals: Improve practitioner (LEA and school) knowledge of data-based decision making and selection and use of evidence-based practices. 100% of selected LEAs rated collaboration among SSIP team members as high or very high. 93% rated their engagement in implementing SSIP activities as high or very high. 80% participating in SSIP webinars rated them as being of high quality, relevant, and useful. 85% of participants in SSIP webinars agreed that they increased their knowledge of strategies to support implementation of evidence-based strategies. 93% of selected LEAs who received technical assistance, coaching, or supports agreed the program specialist's support in these areas was of high quality, relevant, and useful. 93% agreed their assigned program specialist provided technical assistance, coaching, and/or supports that improved the LEA's ability to implement evidence-based practices.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Two: LEA Annual Survey and the Resource Development Log were used. LEA surveys and stakeholder feedback indicated a need for more digital resources and tools for LEAs. 100% of resources were completed in a timely manner.

Short Term Goals: 70% of selected LEAs agreed that SSIP print and digital resources increased their knowledge of strategies to support the implementation of evidence-based practices related to improving effective instruction.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Three: resource development logs, LEA Annual Survey, PL event documents, LEA Plan of Supports, Regional TA (Technical Assistance) surveys, and coaching logs were used to assess implementation progress and outcomes. Data supports the decision to continue each of the improvement strategies. Staff of targeted LEAs are pleased with the professional learning, technical assistance, and the resources, but they have clearly expressed a need for continued support to build sustainability and continue to focus on increasing graduation rates and student achievement.

Improve LEA and school infrastructure to support educators in implementing evidence-based practices to support teaching and learning.

Short Term Goals: 100% of selected LEA Plan of Supports included specific strategies for addressing improvement in graduation rates and achievement for Students with Disabilities (SWD)

- 85% of selected LEAs scored "Operational" or "Exemplary" on the Student Success LEA Team Fidelity Rubric scoring higher than target of 71%. Increase engagement of stakeholders in planning, implementing, and monitoring improvement initiatives.
- 90% of LEA personnel reported engagement with other departments and regional technical assistance providers at collaborative/transformational levels exceeding the 88% target.
- 100% of the 10 selected LEAs participated in the SPP/APR and SSIP stakeholder meetings.

Mid-Term Goals: EBP RUBRIC

Improve fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices to support teaching and learning for all students.

- 100% of the selected LEAs chose moderate/strong level of evidence EBPs to implement. This met the target goal.
- 83% of selected schools were implementing EBPs at the full implementation level based upon LEA Plan of Supports Short Term Action Plans, Coaching Logs, monthly LEA meeting minutes, and benchmark data provided by the LEA. This exceeded the target of 68%.
- 66% were implementing EBPs with fidelity as measured by the GaDOE Implementation Fidelity Checklist for Evidence-Based Practices. The State met the 60% target goal.

Mid-Term Goals: Student achievement data derived from the FS175 and FS178 files for Math and Reading/Language Arts respectively was analyzed during the current reporting period. The Georgia Systems of Continuous Improvement framework (see <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Pages/Georgia%E2%80%99s-Systems-of-Continuous-Improvement.aspx>) was used to create a common problem-solving process that used across all LEAs to identify improvement strategies and practices implemented to improve student outcomes. Georgia's Systems of Continuous Improvement includes five steps: identify needs, select interventions, plan implementation, implement plan, examine progress. These strategies and practices identified through the problem-solving process were documented in the District Improvement Plans or District Plans of Support. Schools also used the framework to identify improvement strategies and practices that were included in School Improvement Plans. Implementation of the problem-solving process with fidelity at the LEA and school levels is critical to achieving the desired effects because the implementation of the process itself leads to the selection and implementation of specific evidence-based practices based on district/school needs and capacity to implement. Intensive professional learning and follow-up technical assistance was provided by the GaDOE to support LEAs in utilizing this framework.

Improve academic proficiency of students with disabilities in selected LEAs scoring developing or above on state assessments.

KEY MEASURE: The percentage of students with disabilities in LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. The target is 42% proficiency for ELA and Math.

• The Percentage of students with disabilities in LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System on the End of Grade (EOG) for 2021-2022 was 5.72% for ELA and 5.48% for Math. The percentage of non-SWD students scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System on the EOG was 27.29% for ELA and 23.89% Math.

KEY MEASURE: Percentage of students with disabilities in target LEAs scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System. The target is 35% proficiency in both ELA and Math.

• Percentage of students with disabilities in target LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring proficient or higher on Georgia End of Course or End of Grade for ELA for 2021-2022 was 3.25% for ELA and 3.60% for Math.

• Percentage of students with disabilities in LEAs selected to receive intensive supports scoring proficient or higher on Georgia End of Course or End of Grade for 2021-2022 was 3.7% for both ELA and Math.

KEY MEASURE: Percentage of selected LEAs decreasing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and the All-Students Group. The target is that 60% of the selected LEAs will decrease the gap.

• State assessment gaps were determined by evaluating the difference between the gaps for 2021 and 2022 results on the Georgia Milestones Assessment for LEAs at the 4th, 8th, and high school levels in ELA and Math. The percentage of LEAs reducing the gap in ELA were reported as: 50% grade 4, 30% grade 8, and 0% high school. LEAs reducing the gap in Math were reported as: 30% grade 4, 20% grade 8, and 10% high school.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Coherent Improvement Strategy One: Provide high quality professional learning to leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

The State will continue its SSIP PL series for teachers and administrators. The State is contracting with Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey and Americans Institute of Research (AIR) to expand training and resources for Specially Designed Instruction to support Student Success. The State will continue to offer multi-sensory reading grants to identified LEAs with targeted support improvement and SSIP status. The anticipated outcome is that Specially Designed Instruction as well as targeted reading and attendance/grades/behavior interventions are implemented with greater fidelity resulting in improved student outcomes. Specific targets for Strategy One are available in the Evaluation Plan.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Two: Develop and disseminate print and digital resources to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

Based on data analysis, survey and stakeholder engagement, the State is building a statewide Early Warning System Dashboard for all LEAs to identify

at-risk students who need interventions. The anticipated outcome is that targeted LEAs will have the necessary resources to fully implement the Early Warning System and Check and Connect.

Coherent Improvement Strategy Three: Provide technical assistance including coaching to support leaders, teachers, and families in selected districts to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes.

The Special Education and School Administrator Academy will work with LEAs by providing targeted professional learning and follow up sessions for additional support. Check and Connect and the Early Warning System data collection within targeted LEAs will be refined for more frequent feedback from the GaDOE SSIP team. The anticipated outcome is that targeted LEAs will review progress monitoring information on interventions in a timelier manner and make adaptations as warranted. It is anticipated that enhanced progress monitoring will enable the GaDOE SSIP team to work more collaboratively with targeted LEAs in meeting students' needs.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

GaDOE provided guidance and training on selecting EBPs to all LEAs and tailored presentations were presented to the 10 selected LEAs. The EBPs the LEAs and schools chose were reviewed by GaDOE to ensure they met ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) and GaDOE level of evidence requirements. For this reporting period the following evidence-based practices were implemented: Check and Connect, Early Warning System, System 44, Achieve 3000, Lexia Core 5, SRA, Learning A-Z, Orton-Gillingham, Classworks, and Townsend Press.

The Check and Connect Mentoring Framework was implemented in five LEAs, Atlanta Public Schools, Clayton, Dekalb County, Treutlen, and Meriwether County with an average of 100 students participating (this average includes the transition of students moving in and out of the LEA). The Early Warning System, an at-risk indicator and intervention framework, was implemented in Clayton County with consistent monitoring of over 75 students. Nine LEAs (Treutlen, Seminole, Richmond, Newton, Dekalb, Clayton, Clarke, Bibb, and Atlanta Public Schools) impacted over 500 students through the implementation of reading interventions. The interventions utilized were System 44, Achieve 3000, Lexia Core 5, Lexia Power Up, Read180, iReady, SRA's Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading, Orton-Gillingham, and Townsend Press's Groundwork for College Reading.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

Two of the evidence-based practices, the Check and Connect Mentoring Framework developed by the University of Minnesota and the Early Warning System validated by the American Institute for Research, are designed to improve graduation rates by monitoring indicators such as attendance, course completion, and discipline infractions. In each of these practices, teachers, counselors, and administrators at schools are assigned specific students to monitor on the indicators for graduation. Specific adults in the schools are assigned as mentors to students at-risk of dropping out and develop a relationship with the students and families through the Check and Connect Framework. The Early Warning System utilizes a team of professionals at the school level to monitor indicators such as attendance and behavior to provide support to at-risk students. Research has indicated that students are less likely to drop out of school if they have a relationship with caring adults in the school setting.

The reading interventions are all designed to improve reading ability including reading fluency and comprehension which is also very clearly aligned with high school graduation. System 44 and Read 180 are explicit reading interventions that incorporate the use of technology with frequent progress monitoring of reading comprehension. Both are designed to be used at a specified frequency for efficacy (i.e., 60 minutes a day). SRA's Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading are explicit and scripted structured reading interventions. The SRA programs are designed with frequent progress monitoring and a specified scope and sequence in addition to the recommended amount of time to be implemented with students. Progress monitoring assesses reading fluency and comprehension. Orton-Gillingham is a methodology that incorporates multisensory intervention designed with frequent progress monitoring measuring reading fluency and comprehension. Lexia Core 5 and Lexia Power Up are reading interventions designed to improve reading fluency and comprehension as measured by the reading Lexiles of participants. Lexia Core 5 and Power Up utilize a computer-based platform to provide intervention. Frequent progress monitoring and differentiated literacy instruction are the primary components of these interventions. Townsend Press builds the reading skills needed for college and career success. The College Reading Essentials measures students' reading comprehension and can be implemented in both print and digital resources. Achieve 3000 is a differentiated literacy program designed to improve the reading comprehension of students in the upper grades. Frequent progress monitoring using reading Lexiles as the measure and differentiated instruction are the key components of Achieve 3000. Classworks is an online tiered intervention solution for reading that combines assessment, instruction, progress monitoring, and reporting in a computer platform. iReady is a personalized learning platform designed to provide targeted literacy intervention.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

Each Evidence Based Practice (EBP) supports the SiMR by providing strategies that address each school's root cause analysis needs found in their LEA data analysis. Each addresses the unique needs of each school. Check and Connect and Early Warning Systems address the emotional and academic achievement needs of students, change teacher practice, and build family engagement to support the SiMR. Each of the 12 reading interventions were chosen based upon data analysis and review to meet the achievement needs of the targeted students and to support change in teacher practices. The LEA level of interaction has moved from informing to collaborating and transforming.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Eighty-five percent of selected schools (22/26) within the ten targeted LEAs were implementing EBPs at the full implementation level based upon LEA Plan of Supports Short Term Action Plans, Coaching Logs, monthly LEA meeting minutes, and benchmark data provided by the LEA. The State, as part of the collective support provided by School and LEA Improvement and the Division for Special Education Supports and Services collects the following measures of success: LEA Team Implementation Fidelity Rubric with evidence to support building capacity and sustainability in the LEA; Evidence-based Practice Fidelity Rubric is used to measure the implementation fidelity of EBPs; benchmark data on EBPs; LEA Annual Survey to measure the level of satisfaction the LEAs have with supports from the State to improve outcomes; State/Regional Technical Support Annual Survey to measure the satisfaction around regional technical assistance and coaching; professional learning evaluation survey to measure the satisfaction level of participants with professional learning they receive; LEA Plan of Support Short Term Action Plan progress data to measure the extent to which LEAs are implementing their plan and meeting their expected outcomes; State assessment data on academic proficiency; annual event graduation rates; LEA benchmark data; and data from continuous improvement team meetings to measure increased student achievement and graduation rates.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Early Warning System benchmark data collected from Clayton County indicated the need for the continued scrutiny of this intervention. Previous results have been favorable. The current results indicated continued attendance and course failure at a higher rate than is acceptable.

Check and Connect data from Meriwether and Atlanta Public Schools yielded favorable results. Students in targeted schools participating in the intervention showed over 50% improvement in attendance and course completion for both LEAs. The intervention did not reduce ISS or OSS percentages for participants in Meriwether. The number of student participants reported for specific schools were: Atlanta Public Schools (Kindezi 22, Booker T. Washington HS 28), DeKalb County (Cedar Grove HS 40, Chamblee Charter HS 39, Freedom MS 38, Lithonia HS 39, Martin Luther King, Jr. Academy 40, McNair MS 39, Miller Grove HS 40, Miller Grove MS 40, Redan HS 38, Redan MS 37, Salem MS 38, Stephenson HS 39, Stone Mountain MS 40, Tucker HS 40, Tucker MS 40), Meriwether County (Manchester HS 19, Manchester MS 13, Greenville HS 14, Greenville MS 9), and Treutlen County (Treutlen County MS/HS 13).

Classworks is an online tiered intervention solution that combines assessment, instruction, progress monitoring, and powerful reporting in one easy-to-use platform used in two schools (Mixon ES and Salem ES in Newton County). Benchmarks indicated all students are progressing at the Beginning and Developing Level.

Available literacy intervention data yielded the following results for specified LEAs:

- Treutlen County (System 44/Read 180) indicated that 51 students participated with improvement in 43 of 51 in Comprehension and 43 of 51 in Decoding.
- Seminole County (Orton Gillingham) had 41 participants with a 16.33% increase in fluency.
- Richmond County (SRA Corrective Reading) had 296 participants with 64% exceeding the expectation for the end of year benchmark.
- DeKalb (Ascend, Reading Plus, and Lexia Core) participants demonstrated less than the expected gain. The gain expectation was 2 months, and the results were 1.9 months.
- Clarke (iReady) participants 72 out of 106 students showed growth on the 2nd iReady Diagnostic. There were 59 students out of 101 students with growth on the 3rd iReady Diagnostic.
- Bibb (Achieve3000) average usage minutes were not at the recommended 90 minutes per week goal, and Lexile growth was not demonstrated each month for participants.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Check and Connect and Early Warning System: The State will continue to monitor the implementation fidelity and progress of each evidence-based practice and collect on-going quarterly benchmark data. Review of progress will continue to be discussed at the monthly district meeting. SSIP Program Specialists will ask districts to produce progress monitoring data and discuss as well as the level of implementation fidelity. Schools have assigned a point person to monitor the implementation fidelity of each intervention. Districts are encouraged to implement the interventions with fidelity and give them time to show progress before deciding to change them. The SSIP will also help ensure staff are trained and provided the necessary supports for implementation. With these strategies in place, the benchmark and rate of implementation fidelity is expected to be greater in the next reporting period. Literacy Interventions (SRA Corrective Reading, Read 180, Townsend Press Reading, iReady, Achieve 3000): The State will continue to monitor the implementation fidelity and progress of each evidence-based practice and collect on-going quarterly benchmark data. Review of progress will continue to be discussed at the monthly district meeting. SSIP Program Specialists will ask districts to produce progress monitoring data and discuss as well as the level of implementation fidelity. Schools have an assigned point person to monitor the implementation fidelity of each intervention. Districts are encouraged to implement the interventions with fidelity and give them time to show progress before deciding to change them. The SSIP will also help ensure staff are trained and provided the necessary supports for implementation. With these strategies in place, the benchmark and rate of implementation fidelity is expected to be greater in the next reporting period.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.**

The State Advisory Panel, Collaborative Community stakeholders and other SSIP stakeholders voiced through surveys, virtual discussions and monthly SSIP meetings that more professional learning is needed to address instructional strategies, retention of special education teachers and supports to school based administrators. On the SSIP LEA Annual Survey, stakeholders asked for more training for specially designed instruction, high leverage practices (HLPs), and support to new teachers and administrators. Because of this data the State is expanding Coherent Strategy One: Professional Learning activities.

The SSIP PL Series which was extremely popular this year will continue. A Special Education and School Based Administrator Academy (SESBA) began in January 2022 with 142 school-based administrators. A second cohort began in July 2022 with 305 administrators. Two executive coaches support the SSIP work in the schools along with the two-program specialist. SESAA will continue to provide focused professional learning and coaching to school-based administrators, expanding the SSIP work to the school level, rather than just the LEA level. A website for school administrators has been developed and will continue in expansion to meet the needs of schools (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Sp-Ed-and-School-Based-Admins.aspx>).

To address the request from stakeholders to provide more support in the area of specially designed instruction, the State is contracting with Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey from America's Institute of Research to provide ongoing training and coaching around Specially Designed Instruction (SDI). A webpage was built and is updated frequently with SDI asynchronous and synchronous modules, tools, and resources (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)). The GaDOE has made a five year commitment to the work of specially designed instruction. A Multi-Sensory Reading Grant to train teachers in multi-sensory reading approaches such as Orton-Gillingham, LETRS, and Wilson Reading and to receive training in Dyslexia has been offered to build capacity for special education teachers in the area of literacy. Beginning in July 2022 through December 2022 Multi-Sensory PL sessions have been offered to teachers. In an effort to provide multiple opportunities for teachers to attend, virtual afterschool sessions are repeated. The Instruction and Systemic Improvement unit works directly with the Georgia Learning Resource Systems (GLRS) directors and has offered 1–2-day SDI and Multi-Sensory learning PL for K-12 teachers. GLRS provides support for all SSIP initiatives through their website (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Georgia-Learning-Resources-System.aspx>).

In partnership with Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR), The Teacher Provider Retention Program provides professional development on High Leverage Practices to new special education teachers. Great Teacher Leaders and several higher education institutions have also been implemented to support Coherent Strategies 1 Professional learning and address outcomes for mid-term goals around student achievement and graduation rates. Each of these additional professional learning projects are to support the short and mid-term goals related to student achievement and building capacity.

The State has updated targets for short-term, mid-term and long-term goals due to challenges related to the pandemic. These additional professional

learning events are supported by challenges remain as turnover of LEA and school leadership and teachers remains dramatically high. It is necessary to continue to train and retrain new LEA leaders and teachers. Stakeholder input, survey results and data trend analytics reviews indicated we are making slight progress with our current activities but must continue to build capacity and address challenges around retention. Stakeholder feedback continues to ask for specific digital tools and resources to guide the work of Student Success. The SSIP collaborates with Georgia's Teacher Provider Retention Program to help selected LEAs recruit and retain special education teachers (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Ga-Teacher-Provider-Retention-Grant.aspx>). The program provides ongoing PL around HLPs (High Leverage Practices). The ten selected LEAs are making progress but face many challenges. The continued consistency of SSIP activities is key to building sustainability.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiansights.com/wholechild.html>). The GaDOE also continues with its vision to make education work for all Georgians. Toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development and review of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through age 22
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local LEA educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local LEA Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter schools
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Services
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents Association

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the status of targets for the 2020-2025 package on September 14, 2022, October 25, 2022, November 10, 2022, and January 20, 2023. The SAP worked diligently with DSESS leadership in the 2021-2022 school year to establish baselines and targets for the 2020-2025 package. To continue meaningful work in advisement on the SPP/APR during the 2022-2023 school year, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive review presentation of the SPP/APR 2020-2025 package in the September 14, 2022, and October 25, 2022, meetings. The presentations informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2021. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. Beginning with the September meeting and continuing throughout the January 20, 2023, meeting SAP participants were provided with updated data for the FFY2021 targets.

The SAP performed the advisory role in a highly active capacity. There continued to be many questions and suggestions about the rigor of the targets and the progress of students with disabilities in meeting the targets. The SAP also had questions about academic programming and initiatives for transition to empower students to meet the targets and have better life outcomes. On November 10, 2022, a number of program specialists from the DSESS presented to the SAP regarding transition initiatives, self-determination, and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities in alignment with the SPP/APR targets. This presentation and others were made available to the SAP in a live binder. These presentations were also made publicly available at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx).

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 6 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 24, 2022 and ended December 9, 2022. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 380 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the December 9, 2022 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey Evaluation 2020-2025 and emailed to all participants. The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education

personnel in their region. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) website above on January 9, 2023.

According to the Annual LEA Survey, 100% of selected LEAs reported collective support between School and LEA Improvement (SDI) and DSESS were highly effective and provided high-quality relevant supports and resources. 100% of stakeholders surveyed agree collaboration should continue. 93% of selected LEAs/schools reported the SSIP Program Specialists were effective and provided high-quality professional learning, technical assistance and coaching that changed practices for student success. All stakeholders surveyed agree the focus of SSIP should remain on graduation but also provide professional learning for student achievement in literacy and mathematics. Other areas of need noted on the Annual LEA Survey and Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Survey were the need for additional training for building level leaders, how to engage students, assistance with recruiting and retaining special education teachers, assistance with recruiting and retaining special education teachers, teaching how to implement Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) and help with IEP implementation.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

For FFY 21 stakeholder engagement was conducted virtually using TEAMS and one in person session with the State Advisory Panel in September 2022. Stakeholders were invited via email, through SSIP/SDE points of contacts, Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership, GLRS (Georgia Learning Resource System) and individual phone calls. Stakeholders were given multiple opportunities and ways to respond and provide feedback. Several virtual tools were used to gather input such as chat boxes, small group breakout discussions, surveys, Mentimeter, Easy Retro, and virtual whiteboards. Each of the stakeholder groups had opportunities to provide suggestions regarding changes in improvement strategies and activities. In addition, stakeholders were invited to address concerns they had about the implementation activities or to make recommendations for improvement between meetings through phone and email communication. Stakeholders who participated in SPP/APR webinar sessions in November and December had an opportunity to participate in a feedback survey regarding the SSIP target for graduation.

The SSIP has a webpage (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/SSIP-.aspx>) which posts SSIP guides, resources and tools to support the implementation of the SSIP. It publishes previous reports, ongoing professional learning opportunities, fidelity measures, logic model and evaluation plans. These resources and tools provide access to any stakeholder if they want to learn more about the SSIP work.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

There are continued concerns about student attendance, school-based administrators being novice to special education, and special education teacher retention continue to be concerns from stakeholders. As stated above the State has implemented the teacher provider retention program to support the retention and training of new special education teachers. The SSIP is providing a School-Based Administrator Academy with mixed reality simulations to support novice administrators. The State stresses we are here to support LEAs during these challenging times. Several professional learning resources have been created to support increasing engagement and attendance. The State reports on progress of addressing the issues to stakeholders on a regular basis. Stakeholders also expressed concerns about the state level assessment results for students with disabilities and the increase in the achievement gap based on assessment results. As indicated throughout this document, these concerns are being addressed through numerous initiatives such as the Specially Designed Instruction initiative. Multiple K-12 virtual professional learning opportunities are offered to teachers in multi-sensory learning strategies in spelling and vocabulary, and classroom engagement strategies.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

The State has no other activities to describe.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

The State has not identified any new barriers. Georgia continues to seek solutions to everyday challenges and provide support to districts.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

**17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**17 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

#### **Name:**

Wina Low

#### **Title:**

Director

#### **Email:**

wlow@doe.k12.ga.us

#### **Phone:**

17708277537

#### **Submitted on:**

04/25/23 9:56:47 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

## 2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination<sup>1</sup>

Percentage (%)	Determination
78.47%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
<b>Results</b>	24	15	62.50%
<b>Compliance</b>	18	17	94.44%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	88%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	87%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	25%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	90%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	35%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	88%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	88%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	87%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	44%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	91%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	22%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89%	1

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

**Exiting Data Elements**

<b>Exiting Data Elements</b>	<b>Performance (%)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out</b>	21	0
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**</b>	69	0

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator <sup>2</sup>	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	1.86%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	98.13%	NO	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	98.10%	NO	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	93.54%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	92.59%		1
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

<sup>2</sup> The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: [https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023\\_Part-B\\_SPP-APR\\_Measurement\\_Table.pdf](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf)

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR<sup>3</sup>

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	21
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

<sup>3</sup> In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

	618 Data <sup>4</sup>			
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			<b>Subtotal</b>	21
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total</b> (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

<sup>4</sup> In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

<b>Indicator Calculation</b>	
A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
<b>Denominator</b>	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

---

## APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

### SPP/APR Data

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

### Part B 618 Data

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in May

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check** – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>