

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

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

**For reporting on
FFY18**

Georgia



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**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

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

212

General Supervision System

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

The Division for Special Education Services and Supports at the Georgia Department of Education (GADOE) 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 Division provided appropriate accountability to ensure that Local Educational Agencies (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. Monitoring can be defined as "a continuing function or operation that uses systematic collection and analysis of data on specified indicators to provide management and stakeholders with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of targets and progress in continuous improvement."

The Division monitors each district every year to ensure timely identification and correction of any identified noncompliance. At each tier, the Division conducts a systematic collection and analysis of data to inform compliant practices and improve results. As the tiers ascend, there is increased intensity in the review of data. LEAs are targeted for each tier based either on data or the Division's monitoring cycle.

Tier 1 monitoring procedures were implemented for all LEAs in the state to enforce compliance and improve results.

Tier 1 activities include a review of District Determination Data, District Summary of APR Activities, District Improvement Activities, Continuation of Services Data, Fiscal Risk Assessment, Data Validation Checks and Dispute Resolution Data.

Tier 2 monitoring procedures were consistently implemented for a targeted group of LEAs based on data.

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 or the Division's monitoring cycle. In most instances, Tier 3 monitoring activities were conducted onsite. Records Reviews may be an onsite activity or online if the LEA is participating in the Georgia Online IEP system. The monitoring activities at Tiers 2 and 3 provide the Division with documentation to review district level policies, procedures, and practices.

Tier 4 monitoring procedures were implemented for any LEAs that demonstrated difficulty in timely correcting noncompliance. Based on the review of data from these components, the Division ensured timely identification and correction of noncompliance that ultimately fostered a "continuous improvement monitoring process."

An example for these how this process was operationalized during FFY17 can be shown in the support we provided to LEAs in the area of disproportionality. In Tier 1, the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) provided state level support to the LEAs with ongoing monitoring and analysis data sets that are relevant to Disproportionality outcomes, as well as input on the individual LEAs policies, practices and procedures. Tier 2 support consisted of regional meetings guiding districts in implementing strategies (including a district level tool) designed to help school districts address disproportionality. Tier 3 support for disproportionality consisted of a statewide Best Practices forum for LEAs that were found non-compliant through a direct monitoring of policies, procedures and student records. At these forums, selected LEAs offered tools, strategies and preventative measures that had been effective in reducing or eliminating the district level disproportionality. In addition, below is an explanation for several of the monitoring activities.

Record Reviews - The Division for Special Education Services and Supports conducted Record Reviews to evaluate due process procedural compliance for LEAs. The Division reviewed records from all LEAs which included IEPs and transition plans.

Fiscal Monitoring - Monitoring of federal programs is conducted to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. Cross Functional Monitoring emphasizes accountability for using federal resources wisely. Monitoring serves as a vehicle for the Georgia Department of Education to help LEAs achieve high quality implementation of educational programs utilizing the LEAs' federal allocations.

LEAs are monitored on a four-year cycle (approximately 1/4 each year). However, some LEAs may be monitored more frequently such as those LEAs that are deemed High Risk or for other reasons the GADOE may think necessary. Risk assessment is completed to determine if an LEA falls into the high-risk category. The Department's Office of Federal Programs defines high-risk as:

LEAs showing evidence of serious or chronic compliance problems

LEAs with previous financial monitoring/audit findings

LEAs with a high number of complaints from parents and other stakeholders about program implementation

and other LEAs as deemed necessary

Each Federal Program has indicators for which that program will be monitored. The Uniform Grant's Guidance, along with other pertinent federal regulations, guides the fiscal monitoring process of Cross Functional Monitoring. All other indicators for each program could be fiscal or programmatic in nature.

Data Verifications and Audits - The Division for Special Education 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. Although some monitoring procedures are in place for all LEAs, this level of verification impacted a target group of LEAs.

Dispute Resolution - The Division for Special Education 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 Division for Special Education required the Compliance Review protocol for all LEAs identified as having some type of disproportionality determination. The Division reviewed these data and other pertinent documentation to identify noncompliance.

Timeline Reviews - Timeline summary reports are submitted as a part of the required publicly reported data to the Division for Special Education. 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.

During FFY17, face to face sessions of Technical Assistance (TA) were conducted for all Georgia LEAs for the Implementation Manual updates. 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. The TA was conducted in several sessions and was made available to all of Georgia's district-level personnel.

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.

To support the state in addressing its needs assistance status, 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), and the National Center for Systematic Improvement (NCSI). A team from Georgia attended the Part B Cross State Learning Collaborative. Information and resources from this conference have informed the work of the SSIP regarding all aspects of improving the graduation rate for students with disabilities. 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 (NTACT) to address the challenges of dropout prevention, improving graduation rates, and strengthening transition planning services.

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 students with disabilities.

Professional Development (PD) may be at a basic level of providing general information to a more targeted and intensive level of learning, which is job-embedded and data-driven focus on student achievement and school improvement. Research suggests that to build capacity, a framework that includes understanding the stages of 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 a system commit to a multi-year process of improvement. The Division of Special Education Services 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 University of Kansas Transition Center (KU), 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, the 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 district, administrative, school or specialist's 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:

- Georgiastandards.org Resources and Videos: <https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>
- 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>
- GaDOE Special Education Professional Learning Resources: <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Professional-Learning-Resources-.aspx>

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

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

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, 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)

Here the viewer may see Georgia's APR for the current year and also previous years.

School systems' public reports of the APR is also available for public viewing. These documents can be found at the following link:

https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/_Layout.html The user must enter a zip code of the school system or type the name of school system they would like to view.

In addition to the Annual Performance Reports, Georgia's website contains links to SEA, local school system and School Level Assessment data (suppressed at cell size of 15). SEA Discipline data, Exiting data, Federal Child Count data, Environment data, 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 as lagging data since Georgia has access to this information earlier than required for SPP/ APR. For example, the FFY2018 the data is reported on Georgia's annual report for 2017-2018 school year.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	35.20%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	47.40%	53.20%	54.00%	54.50%	57.60%
Data	35.09%	36.50%	54.33%	56.59%	56.27%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	57.58%	62.27%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide

the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Georgia has received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan, which includes targets for graduation and academic achievement for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup as is reflected in Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI). A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students. Georgia's methodology to calculate graduation and achievement targets for the APR is the same methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The baseline and the formula for the ESSA plan are the same as used for the SPP/APR with the only difference being the denominator for the SPP/APR is only SWDs. Georgia is utilizing the same ambitious approach to setting ESSA goals for high school graduation rates as it is for academic achievement. The expectation is for all schools to continue to make improvements and decrease achievement gaps. As such, goals will be based on continuous improvement. Under the ESSA, Georgia is creating a new target structure in which growth or maintenance of high achievement levels is expected of all schools and all subgroups. The goal of Georgia's new target structure is to incentivize continuous, sustainable improvement. The State will calculate graduation rate improvement targets, defined as 3% of the gap between 2017 data as the baseline and 100%. The 3% improvement target aligns with Georgia's robust system of state accountability in which all but two Georgia LEAs have a performance contract with the state. While there are various accountability provisions in the two sets of state performance contracts – Strategic Waiver School System (SWSS) and Charter System contracts – one provision of the SWSS contracts is best suited to be utilized as the state's goals for ESSA. The SWSS contracts require schools to decrease the gap between baseline performance on the state accountability system by 3% annually. The methodology for setting the targets for academic achievement was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	8,982
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	14,697
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	61.11%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
8,982	14,697	56.27%	57.58%	61.11%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

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) in the standard time of 4 years. Graduates must have met course and assessment criteria. Georgia offers one diploma for all students. The links below provide information for the assessment and graduation requirements:
 Graduation: (<http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/AskDOE/Pages/Graduation-Requirements.aspx>)

Georgia is reporting data from the 2017-2018 school year. This represents lagged data based on OSEP's requirement to report data as submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), the adjusted cohort graduation rate.

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

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

On August 23, 2019, GaDOE requested a waiver to permit the State to include in the ACGR students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take an alternate assessment based upon alternate achievement standards (AA-AAAS) and who would otherwise meet the definition for a State-defined alternate diploma, even though Georgia currently awards the student a regular diploma. The waiver was approved November 21, 2019 allowing Georgia to not remove students assessed with the alternate assessment who earn a regular diploma from the graduation rate calculation.

As indicated, during the 2019-2020 school year, Georgia will amend its Graduation Rule to adopt an Alternate Diploma that meets the requirements in ESEA sections 8101(23)(A)(ii)(I)(bb) and 8101(25)(A)(ii)(I)(bb). This option will be available to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take Georgia's AA-AAAS and who enter high school in the 2020-2021 school year. Georgia plans to apply for an extension to the waiver for future graduation rate calculations.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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 C009.

OPTION 2:

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

OPTION 1:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

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.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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.

OPTION 2:

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.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	6.10%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	5.90%	5.90%	5.80%	5.70%	5.60%
Data	5.68%	5.90%	5.60%	5.60%	5.74%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	5.50%	5.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	9,513
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	611
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	3,437
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	50

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

The dropout rate calculation is the same for students with and without disabilities. The State used the dropout data for FFY2016 which used 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.

The calculation is the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 9-12 with a withdrawal code corresponding to a dropout divided by the number of SWD in grades 9-12.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Total number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 9-12 with a withdrawal code corresponding to a dropout	Total number of SWD in grades 9-12	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,699	67,679	5.74%	5.50%	5.47%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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)

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2011	Target >=	98.40%	98.40%	98.45%	98.45%	98.50%
A	Overall	98.70%	Actual	99.18%	98.18%	99.14%	99.13%	98.89%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2011	Target >=	97.70%	97.70%	97.75%	97.75%	97.80%
A	Overall	98.00%	Actual	98.95%	97.10%	99.43%	98.83%	98.56%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	98.75%	98.75%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	98.25%	98.25%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Georgia has received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for graduation and academic achievement for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup as is reflected in Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI). A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students. Georgia's methodology to calculate graduation and achievement targets for the APR is the same methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The baseline and the formula for the ESSA plan are the same as used for the SPP/APR with the only difference being the denominator for the SPP/APR is only SWDs. Georgia is utilizing the same ambitious approach to setting ESSA goals for high school graduation rates as it is for academic achievement. The expectation is for all schools to continue to make improvements and decrease achievement gaps. As such, goals will be based on continuous improvement. Under the ESSA, Georgia is creating a new target structure in which growth or maintenance of high achievement levels is expected of all schools and all subgroups. The goal of Georgia's new target structure is to incentivize continuous, sustainable improvement. The state will calculate rate improvement targets, defined as 3% of the gap between 2017 data as the baseline and 100%. The 3% improvement target aligns with Georgia's robust system of state accountability in which all but two Georgia LEAs have a performance contract with the state. While there are various accountability provisions in the two sets of state performance contracts – Strategic Waiver School System (SWSS) and Charter System contracts – one provision of the SWSS contracts is best suited to be utilized as the state's goals for ESSA. The SWSS contracts require schools to decrease the gap between baseline performance on the state accountability system by 3% annually. The methodology for setting the targets for academic achievement was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	18,572	19,786	20,589	19,577	18,774	17,714	114	1,440	10,820	1,059	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,141	3,397	2,812	2,105	1,977	1,822	12	201	1,258	187	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,502	14,390	15,724	15,454	14,687	13,705	94	1,180	7,888	826	
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,588	1,652	1,728	1,704	1,776	1,901			1,489		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	18,568	19,785	20,582	19,576	18,766	17,716	10,579	10,954	4,784	1,042	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,151	3,390	2,855	2,110	1,988	1,880	1,729	1,597	309	183	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12,475	14,383	15,672	15,425	14,648	13,632	8,583	9,097	2,657	762	
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,586	1,648	1,727	1,701	1,769	1,893	0	0	1,481	0	

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	128,445	126,200	98.89%	98.75%	98.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	142,352	139,331	98.56%	98.25%	97.88%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

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.

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). Here the viewer may see Georgia's APR for the current year and also previous years.

School systems' public reports of the APR is also available for public viewing. These documents can be found at the following link: https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/_Layout.html The user must enter a zip code of the school system or type the name of school district they would like to view.

In addition to the Annual Performance Reports, Georgia's website contains links to SEA, school system and School Level Assessment data (suppressed at cell size of 15). SEA Discipline data, Exiting data, Federal Child Count data, Environment data, 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>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Elementary/Middle	X	X	X	X	X	X					
B	HS							X	X	X	X	
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary/Middle	2016	Target >=	81.60%	16.77%	16.87%	17.66%	20.13%
A	Elementary/Middle	17.66%	Actual	82.12%	16.77%	16.89%	17.66%	18.45%
B	HS	2016	Target >=	66.40%	12.28%	12.30%	15.73%	18.25%
B	HS	15.73%	Actual	64.45%	12.28%	13.34%	15.73%	20.22%

C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Elementary/Middle	2016	Target >=	72.90%	15.42%	15.90%	19.97%	22.37%
A	Elementary/Middle	19.97%	Actual	63.69%	15.42%	19.14%	19.97%	21.63%
B	HS	2016	Target >=	10.30%	11.07%	11.57%	11.59%	14.25%
B	HS	11.59%	Actual	17.69%	11.07%	12.51%	11.59%	13.87%
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					

G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Elementary/Middle	20.92%	20.23%
Reading	B >=	HS	22.75%	19.83%
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Elementary/Middle	24.03%	22.21%
Math	B >=	HS	16.52%	16.12%
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2

- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Georgia has received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for graduation and academic achievement for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup as is reflected in Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI). A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students. Georgia's methodology to calculate graduation and achievement targets for the APR is the same methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The baseline and the formula for the ESSA plan are the same as used for the SPP/APR with the only difference being the denominator for the SPP/APR is only SWDs. Georgia is utilizing the same ambitious approach to setting ESSA goals for high school graduation rates as it is for academic achievement. The expectation is for all schools to continue to make improvements and decrease achievement gaps. As such, goals will be based on continuous improvement. Under the ESSA, Georgia is creating a new target structure in which growth or maintenance of high achievement levels is expected of all schools and all subgroups. The goal of Georgia's new target structure is to incentivize continuous, sustainable improvement. The state will calculate rate improvement targets, defined as 3% of the gap between 2017 data as the baseline and 100%. The 3% improvement target aligns with Georgia's robust system of state accountability in which all but two Georgia LEAs have a performance contract with the state. While there are various accountability provisions in the two sets of state performance contracts – Strategic Waiver School System (SWSS) and Charter System contracts – one provision of the SWSS contracts is best suited to be utilized as the state's goals for ESSA. The SWSS contracts require schools to decrease the gap between baseline performance on the state accountability system by 3% annually. The methodology for setting the targets for academic achievement was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed.

The target for FFY 18 has been updated. It was incorrectly calculated and reported in the SPP APR last year. Stakeholders have been made aware of this correction.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	18,231	19,439	20,264	19,263	18,440	17,428	106	1,381	10,635	1,013	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above	1,744	1,483	1,260	771	598	560	2	28	311	15	

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	970	1,078	1,213	1,270	753	1,206	2	56	760	48	
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,038	1,076	1,127	1,186	1,264	1,487			1,051		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	18,212	19,421	20,254	19,236	18,405	17,405	11,684	11,111	4,488	967	
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,286	1,842	1,226	764	761	631	520	323	16	3	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,797	1,900	1,320	1,072	1,207	1,242	960	833	71	13	
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,055	937	1,019	1,077	1,044	1,200			952		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary/Middle	113,065	20,084	18.45%	20.92%	17.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	HS	13,135	2,273	20.22%	22.75%	17.30%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Elementary/Middle	XXX
B	HS	Passing high school End of Course assessments is no longer a requirement for course credit or receipt of a regular diploma. End of Course assessments have become more rigorous. The State has provided Specially Designed Instruction training and High Leverage Practices training to improve teacher capacity. As Georgia has also moved to online assessments, SWDs may need direct instruction and practice in taking online assessments.
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Elementary/Middle	112,933	22,380	21.63%	24.03%	19.82%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B	HS	28,250	3,691	13.87%	16.52%	13.07%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Elementary/Middle	Milestone assessments have become progressively more rigorous, prompting a statewide review of our Georgia state standards. Passing statewide assessments is no longer a requirement for promotion to the next grade level. As Georgia has also moved to online assessments, accommodations such as "read-to" are predominately provided online. SWDs may need direct instruction and practice in taking online assessments and using these accommodations instructionally. Georgia is hosting trainings to address this concern.
B	HS	XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

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.

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). Here the viewer may see Georgia's APR for the current year and also previous years.

School systems' public reports of the APR is also available for public viewing. These documents can be found at the following link: https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/_Layout.html The user must enter a zip code of the school district or type the name of school district they would like to view.

In addition to the Annual Performance Reports, Georgia's website contains links to SEA, school system and School Level Assessment data (suppressed at cell size of 15). SEA Discipline data, Exiting data, Federal Child Count data, Environment data, 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>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State revised the targets for FFY 2018, and provided the targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), 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	2015	18.52%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	4.50%	4.40%	18.52%	17.50%	16.50%
Data	4.50%	2.53%	18.52%	18.52%	57.14%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	15.50%	15.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates

- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

194

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	17	57.14%	15.50%	11.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs (District SWD Rate for OSS > 10 Days)/(State SWD Rate for OSS > 10 Days) AND policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral and supports, and procedural safeguards. The rate of suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities (SWD) for greater than 10 days in a school year is defined as: (1) a suspension cell ≥ 10 and (2) a SWD enrollment n-size ≥ 30 (3) a rate ratio ≥ 2.0 for 2 consecutive years when compared to all LEAs in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In prior years Georgia incorrectly reported districts meeting the minimum n-size because we were excluding LEAs if they were not flagged for potential significant discrepancy. This year we are reporting all LEAs who meet the minimum n-size which has increased the denominator and decreased the FFY2018 data percentage.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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.

The state provides the review of policies, procedures and practices by examining written procedures and practices related to this area to ensure that all IDEA requirements are included in the LEA written policies. This includes topics such as implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral

- o interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As examples, the State reviews to determine information such as
- 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
- o if the student has benefited from a behavior intervention plan, which includes positive behavioral interventions and supports

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

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.

The State ensures that after completing the review, each school system with noncompliance is appropriately notified and advised of next steps. As appropriate, the school system may be required to revise its policies, procedures and practices. The State requires the school system to correct individual instances of noncompliance and submit updated data after revising practices to comply with Prong 2 correction. Through the use of monitoring protocol, the State thoroughly reviews identified student files. For districts identified as having noncompliance, the State requires the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The districts receive written notification of the noncompliance and are required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. In addition, the State offered a Disproportionality Forum to support districts with implementing effective practices.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State identified four districts with significant discrepancy. The State required the 4 districts to convene district level teams to complete the Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports or procedural safeguards. The noncompliant districts demonstrated noncompliant practices as they related to the following areas: (1) Development and implementation of Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), (2) Appropriate use of a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA), and (3) Use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

In addition the State ensured noncompliance was corrected by providing technical assistance to the LEAs, monitoring and approving their corrective action plan, and had scheduled communication with the LEAs to verify improvement, as well as providing professional development and ensuring the professional development was provided to appropriate staff of the LEA.

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

For the districts identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The districts received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. The State verified that the district (1) was 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 Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008. The noncompliant data was required to be addressed, with evidence of correction of noncompliance submitted to state staff for their verification and approval. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 1 data came into compliance and that the LEA showed systemic improvement by their sampling of similar student data being compliant.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2018 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	5.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.50%	1.52%	0.00%	5.00%	18.18%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

198

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	2	13	18.18%	0%	15.38%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Percent of districts that have:(a) a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs (District SWD Racial/ethnic subgroup Rate for OSS > 10 Days)/(State SWD Rate for OSS > 10 Days) AND policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral and supports, and procedural safeguards. The rate of suspensions and expulsions for students with disabilities (SWD) for greater than 10 days in a school year is defined as: (1) a suspension cell >= 10 and (2) a SWD enrollment n-size >=30 (3) a rate ratio >= 3.0 for 2 consecutive years when compared to all LEAs in the state.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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.

The state provides the review of policies, procedures and practices by examining written procedures and practices related to this area to ensure that all IDEA requirements are included in the LEA written policies. This includes topics such as implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. As examples, the State reviews to determine information such as

- 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
- o if the student has benefited from a behavior intervention plan, which includes positive behavioral interventions and supports

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

If YES, select one of the following:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

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.

The State ensures that after completing the review, each school system with noncompliance is appropriately notified and advised of next steps. As appropriate, the school system may be required to revise its policies, procedures and practices. The State requires the school system to correct individual instances of noncompliance and submit updated data after revising practices to comply with Prong 2 correction. Through the use of monitoring protocol, the State thoroughly reviews identified student files. For districts identified as having noncompliance, the State requires the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The districts receive written

notification of the noncompliance and are required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. In addition, the State offered a Disproportionality Forum to support districts with implementing effective practices.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

After providing a review of the districts' policies, practices, and procedures, the State made a finding of noncompliance for 2 districts. The noncompliant districts demonstrated noncompliant practices as they related to the following areas: (1) Development and implementation of Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), (2) Appropriate use of a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA), and (3) Use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. The State required the identified districts to convene district level teams to complete the Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports or procedural safeguards. In addition the State ensured noncompliance was corrected by providing technical assistance to the LEAs, monitoring and approving their corrective action plan, and had scheduled communication with the LEAs to verify improvement, as well as providing professional development and ensuring the professional development was provided to appropriate staff of the LEA.

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

For the districts identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The districts received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. The State verified that the district (1) was 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 Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008. The noncompliant data was required to be addressed, with evidence of correction of noncompliance submitted to state staff for their verification and approval. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 1 data came into compliance and that the LEA showed systemic improvement by their sampling of similar student data being compliant.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018 have corrected the noncompliance, 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 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 2018.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs 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

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	65.00%	65.10%	65.20%	65.30%	65.40%
A	54.30%	Data	64.88%	64.87%	64.89%	64.46%	64.06%
B	2005	Target <=	14.50%	14.40%	14.30%	14.20%	14.10%
B	19.40%	Data	14.50%	14.56%	15.04%	15.11%	15.20%
C	2005	Target <=	2.00%	1.80%	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%
C	1.40%	Data	2.02%	2.13%	2.07%	1.97%	1.77%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	65.50%	63.04%
Target B <=	14.00%	16.26%
Target C <=	1.38%	1.35%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	200,450
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	126,373
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	32,590
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	2,245
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	361
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	485

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

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	126,373	200,450	64.06%	65.50%	63.04%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	32,590	200,450	15.20%	14.00%	16.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside the regular class less than 40% of the day							
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,091	200,450	1.77%	1.38%	1.54%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Our proficiency data indicates that many students are struggling with meeting increased expectations in the general education setting. In order to address this, IEP Teams are identifying additional services needed in small group or individual settings to support students in accessing the general curriculum.
B	Slippage for 5B is directly connected to the slippage for 5A. The percentage of students in the general education classroom at least 80% of the day is decreasing in favor of students being placed in more restrictive setting for more of their school day.
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although the 2019 target was entered based on considerations of 2018 data, for the 19-20 school year, GA has elected to include five year old students who are in grade K in the 6-21 LRE count. This will result in a change in the State's calculation methodology impacting FFY2019 data. As a result, FFY2019 will become a new baseline year for Indicator 5 and targets will be reset.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

(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

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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 aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	45.60%	45.80%	46.00%	46.20%	46.40%
A	46.00%	Data	45.57%	44.22%	43.98%	42.95%	41.94%
B	2011	Target <=	24.40%	24.00%	23.00%	23.50%	23.00%
B	22.60%	Data	24.37%	24.07%	24.65%	25.82%	27.44%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	46.60%	46.80%
Target B <=	22.50%	22.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school

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

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	18,661
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	7,792
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	5,415
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	45
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	7,792	18,661	41.94%	46.60%	41.76%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,460	18,661	27.44%	22.50%	29.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	Georgia does not have universal preschool for 3 and 4-year-old children. Local school systems are challenged to find a general education setting for young children, especially those who are 3-years old. The enrollment for children ages 3-5 is steadily increasing in Georgia. Many of our school systems are providing high quality services for young children with disabilities; the services are for many children are often provided in a small group special education classroom setting as there are a limited number of settings in which to include young children. The data reveal that the vast majority of young children represented in the count for indicator 6b are not in residential or separate school settings but in a special education classroom receiving appropriate services.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although the 2019 target was entered based on considerations of 2018 data, for the 19-20 school year, GA has elected to include five year old students who are in grade K in the 6-21 LRE count. This will result in a change in the State's calculation methodology impacting FFY2019 data. As a result, FFY2019 will become a new baseline year for Indicator 6 and targets will be reset based upon that.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	78.35%	78.40%	78.50%	78.50%	78.60%
A1	68.70%	Data	78.36%	80.63%	80.32%	78.46%	79.75%
A2	2008	Target >=	61.40%	61.50%	61.60%	61.70%	61.80%
A2	57.10%	Data	61.42%	61.00%	65.58%	64.30%	62.01%
B1	2008	Target >=	81.00%	81.10%	81.20%	81.30%	81.40%
B1	63.90%	Data	81.03%	84.25%	83.05%	82.49%	82.58%
B2	2008	Target >=	36.70%	36.90%	37.00%	37.10%	37.20%
B2	24.90%	Data	36.70%	42.43%	48.53%	48.62%	47.44%
C1	2008	Target >=	77.35%	77.50%	77.70%	77.90%	78.00%
C1	71.20%	Data	77.38%	81.27%	80.43%	78.55%	79.74%
C2	2008	Target >=	71.45%	71.50%	71.70%	71.90%	72.00%
C2	65.70%	Data	71.49%	70.91%	74.85%	81.58%	71.04%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	78.60%	80.00%
Target A2 >=	62.00%	62.00%
Target B1 >=	81.50%	82.00%
Target B2 >=	37.30%	45.00%
Target C1 >=	78.00%	80.00%
Target C2 >=	72.00%	72.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by

the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

7,535

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	112	1.49%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	835	11.08%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,904	25.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,013	26.72%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,671	35.45%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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>	3,917	4,864	79.75%	78.60%	80.53%	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>	4,684	7,535	62.01%	62.00%	62.16%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	110	1.46%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	981	13.02%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,821	37.44%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,654	35.22%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	969	12.86%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the	5,475	6,566	82.58%	81.50%	83.38%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
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:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3,623	7,535	47.44%	37.30%	48.08%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	114	1.51%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	652	8.65%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,374	18.23%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,800	23.89%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,595	47.71%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	3,174	3,940	79.74%	78.00%	80.56%	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 years of age or exited the program.	5,395	7,535	71.04%	72.00%	71.60%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	XXX
A2	XXX
B1	XXX
B2	XXX
C1	XXX
C2	XXX

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

Please explain why the State did not 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
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

YES

If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

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

Data for Indicator 7 are collected at the student level by each local school system that provides special education services to young children. No statewide assessment exists for young children (ages 3 and 4). Therefore, school systems collect this data using tools such as checklists, observation tools and standardized assessments.

School systems were asked to provide the names of the assessments utilized and reported the following: Formal: Developmental Profile 3 (DP-3), Test of Early Language Development-Third Edition (TELD-3), 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.

To provide guidance to the school systems, the State created a Task Force to study how these data are collected. In addition, GaDOE Special Education leadership has received input from the State Advisory Panel and other stakeholders to guide this work. A spreadsheet is provided to Special Education Directors to enter their student level data. The following information is entered for each preschool student: Student Name, Date of Birth, Program Entry Date, Age of Entry, Entrance Rating, Duration of Service and Exit Rating. Once the information is entered, the spreadsheet calculates the ratings for each of the three Preschool Outcomes. Data is reported for children who have been in the preschool program for at least six months and exit the program to Kindergarten or turn six years old. Special Education Directors report these data in the Preschool Outcomes Application in the GaDOE portal. The summary statements are automatically calculated for each outcome.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding

outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	69.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	44.00%	44.50%	45.00%	69.00%	70.00%
Data	44.00%	46.00%	49.00%	69.00%	71.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	71.00%	72.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
16,080	22,028	71.00%	71.00%	73.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

0

Percentage of respondent parents

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 2018-2019 school year, Georgia used an online survey to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirement. 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. Georgia began using the online survey during the 2016-2017 school year. In prior years Georgia used a sampling methodology which placed some of our schools on a 5-year rotation for participation, not affording all parents the opportunity to participate. Georgia did not report the number of surveys distributed because no distribution takes place. The survey is available to all parents of children with disabilities in Georgia. The Parent Survey allows all parents of children with disabilities ages 3-21 to participate in the survey. 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.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
------------	-----	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	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.	XXX

	Yes / No
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	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), 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 will be provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. A Spanish version of the survey will be available both online and paper format.

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.

Georgia's percentage of parents reporting their schools facilitated parental involvement in FFY18 rose to 73% from 71% in the FFY17. The number of valid responses decreased from 22,687 in FFY2017 to 22,028 in FFY2018. The methodology used by Georgia for the measuring Indicator 8 is an online survey available to all parents of SWD in Georgia; therefore, a number of surveys distributed cannot be reported.

These data were analyzed to examine the demographics of the parents responding. The survey responses were not representative of the SWD enrolled in Georgia for area of disability or race/ethnicity.

The disability area data show that the percentage of responses were slightly higher from parents of children with Autism (5.1% higher than demographic group); the percentage of responses were lower from parents of children with Other Health Impairment (3.6% less than the demographic group) and Specific Learning Disability (9.2% less than the demographic group); responses were commensurate for all other areas of disability (less than 1% difference). 5.4% (1,195) of respondents did not designate the disability category of their child. This is improved from last year.

These data were also examined to compare the state's enrollment by race/ethnicity and the parents' responses by race/ethnicity. These data reveal that a higher percentage of parents of White SWD responded to the survey (53.5%) compared to percentage of White SWD enrolled (39.8%). A lower percentage of parents of Black (29.0%) and Hispanic (10.2%) SWD responded to the survey as compared to Black (39.3%) and Hispanic (14.9%) SWD enrolled. Increased efforts must be made to publicize the availability of the survey to all families. 1.3% (283) of respondents did not report their race/ethnicity category when responding to the survey.

School system 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 FFY19 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 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 FFY 2018, 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.50%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.48%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 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.

4

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	208	0.48%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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 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 special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio >= 3.0 for two consecutive years and (2) SWD Subgroup >= 10.

Georgia has a minimum cell size of 10. Georgia has a minimum n-size of 30.

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 identifies school systems as having disproportionate representation by first examining the data. Any school system that has a Risk Ratio of >= 3.0 for 2 consecutive years for a specific disability category in any racial/ethnic group is considered to have disproportionate representation. The State uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes. Districts whose data reveals that they have disproportionate representation must review their policies, practices and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation (noncompliance). If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State offered a Disproportionality Forum to support districts with implementing effective practices.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State convened a team of colleagues to review the sampling of eligibility reports for compliant practices based on the evaluation and eligibility rules. It was expected that the new sampling would demonstrate compliant practices. After reviewing the sampling, the State provided additional feedback on the school system's progress and held teleconferences with the school system to share the findings. If additional technical assistance was needed, the GaDOE made onsite visits to the districts and held teleconferences and webinars to provide additional support for correction of noncompliance.

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

For the district identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA. The district received written notification of the noncompliance and was required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. The State verified that the district (1) was 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. The noncompliant data was required to be addressed, with evidence of correction of noncompliance submitted to state staff for their verification and approval. State staff

reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 1 data came into compliance and that the LEA showed systemic improvement by their sampling of similar student data being compliant.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

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 FFY 2018, 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 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	8.29%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	6.00%	3.98%	11.27%	8.29%	2.90%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 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.

16

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
20	11	196	2.90%	0%	5.61%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The overall number of school systems with disproportionate representation has been reduced from 35 in FY18 to 20 in FY19. However, the number of those with disproportionate representation that need to revise policies, practices, and procedures has increased. As Georgia has emphasized the critical nature of compliant policies, practices and procedures in every district, we have instituted internal training to assure consistency across reviewers. Due to more training, compliance reviews have become more granular, thus yielding a higher percentage of school systems requiring revisions. This provides an opportunity to make improvement for students and potentially further reduce the number of school systems that fall into this category in the future. The number of districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size decreased from 207 in FFY2017 to 196 in FFY2018 which further impacted the increased percentage.

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 has a minimum cell size of 10 and n size of 30. Georgia has developed a Special Education Dashboard, which enables school systems to view their data and understand how their Risk Ratio is calculated.

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 special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) Risk Ratio = 3.0 for two consecutive years (FFY 2017 = 3.0 and FFY 2018 = 3.0) and (2) SWD Subgroup = 10 (minimum cell size).

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 uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, practices, and procedures to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes. School systems identified as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories must review their policies, practices, and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 11 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. These school systems developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GaDOE staff.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State offered a Disproportionality Forum to support districts with implementing effective practices.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State convened a team of colleagues to review the sampling of eligibility reports for compliant practices based on the evaluation and eligibility rules. It was expected that the new sampling would demonstrate compliant practices. After reviewing the sampling, the State provided additional feedback on the systems' progress and held teleconferences with the school systems to share the findings. If additional technical assistance was needed, the GaDOE held teleconferences and webinars to provide additional support for correction of noncompliance. GaDOE also held a statewide disproportionality forum, regional trainings, and training on the use of a disproportionality tool to assist with data analysis. The State continued to review subsequent data until the school systems demonstrated compliance and all individual incidences of noncompliance were corrected.

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

In FFY 2017, 6 school systems were identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. All 6 districts received written notification of noncompliance with specific provisions of the Part B regulations by June 30, 2018. All 6 school systems corrected the noncompliance within one year of written notification. For the districts identified as having noncompliance, the State supported the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA. The State: (1) required the school system to change policies,

practices, and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance; (2) determined that each school system was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the school system, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02. The school systems were asked to submit for review by the State, a sampling of eligibility reports developed since the noncompliance determination showing evidence of correction of noncompliance for verification and approval. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 1 data came into compliance and that the LEA showed systemic improvement by their sampling of similar student data being compliant. The State continued to review subsequent data until the school systems demonstrated compliance and all individual incidences of noncompliance were corrected.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 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 2018.

10 - Required Actions

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

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2005	85.50%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.28%	98.42%	98.80%	98.56%	97.91%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
35,500	34,980	97.91%	100%	98.54%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

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

520

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 520 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: 227
- Evaluation completed 11-30 days after 60 days: 110
- Evaluation completed 31-60 days after 60 days: 82
- Evaluation completed > 60 days after 60 days: 101

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

- Student delay (excessive absences, withdrawal, re-enrollment): 15 (2.9%)
- Parent delay (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner): 44 (8.5%)
- Teacher/evaluator delay (teachers not following through, lack of psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech language pathologists): 404 (77.7%)
- District errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policy, and procedures): 47 (1.9%)
- Other reasons such as school closure due to weather: 10 (1.9%)
- Total Late: 520 (100%)

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

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.

School systems maintain a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. A spreadsheet is provided for school systems to use which tracks the number of referrals completed on time, eligibility determination of the referrals (eligible or not eligible), if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. For LEAs that opt to use the State-Provided IEP platform, this information is generated within the IEP Platform. Special Education Directors submit the data by July 31st each year for the previous fiscal year. The data are submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application used to track this indicator year-to-year.

The GaDOE reviewed the Child Find data of each school system to ensure timely initial evaluations. Georgia has a 60 day requirement for receipt of consent to completion of the evaluation. The target is 100% completed on time to be in compliance. Based on 09-02 OSEP Memo, Georgia identified noncompliance for this area.

Those LEAs not at 100% must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities.

Prong 1 requires 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 is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students’ names reported as late and the date that the evaluation was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance.

The GaDOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected school systems each year. The verification process ensures timeline data are accurate.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
685	685	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For the districts 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 is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. LEAs maintain a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities completed between July 1 and October 31 were required to be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GA DOE 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 information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 made necessary changes and that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Additionally, each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and a State data system.

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

For FFY2017, 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 Dashboard.

Along with the narrative, the Special Education Directors submitted the list of students’ names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. 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 student who exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

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

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # 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.

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.

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	85.50%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.80%	99.21%	99.75%	99.52%	98.98%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,769
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	873
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,637

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.	179
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	21
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

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	3,637	3,696	98.98%	100%	98.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

In FFY2018 Georgia reported 59 students whose IEPs were not in place by the 3rd birthday. The following data describes the number of days late and the reasons late.

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

1 - 10 days: 19 students

11 - 30 days: 15 students

31 - 60 days: 11 students

> 60 days: 14 students

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

Student delay: 1 student (1.7%)

Parent delay: 17 students (28.8%)

Teacher/evaluator delay: 26 students (44.1%)

System errors: 11 students (18.6%)

Other (school closure due to weather): 4 students (6.8%)

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.

School systems maintain 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 is provided for school system use which tracks the number of referrals, the number of children who have an IEP developed and in place by the 3 birthday, if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. Special Education Directors submit these data by July 31st. The data are submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application used to track this indicator year-to-year.

Special Education Directors are required to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August.

Additionally, Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year Early Childhood Transition data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities and IEPs completed between July 1 and October 31 must be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GADOE staff reviews the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely evaluation.

The GaDOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. If selected, Directors are to upload 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 a school system 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 may then 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 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
35	35	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia requires that each school system submit Early Childhood Transition timeline data by July 31st each year. School systems that reported data that reveal some young children referred to special education from Part C and found eligible but did not have an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 1 to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements. Special Education Directors for the districts 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 is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. The school systems must submit additional data to support systemic corrections and processes are in place. Prong 2 requires 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 and October 31 were required to be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GA DOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation. GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 made any necessary changes and are now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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

Special Education Directors for the districts identified as having noncompliance, are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late (IEP held beyond the 3rd birthday) and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year. GaDOE reviewed the list of all student records with noncompliance, including student names, initial evaluation due dates, and dates the initial evaluation and initial IEP were completed through the Timeline application of the state Dashboard (provided by LEAs). The state verified that each student who exceeded the state timeline had an evaluation completed and, if eligible, IEP implemented (although late) within one year of notification of noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

(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 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2017	94.25%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.98%	97.16%	98.40%	99.09%	94.25%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
476	521	94.25%	100%	91.36%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In FFY2017 Georgia revised the sampling process for collecting Indicator 13 data. The total number of plans reviewed from each school system was greatly reduced. In FFY16 the GaDOE reviewed 4055 plans and of those plans reviewed 4018 were compliant. In FFY17, 574 plans were reviewed and 541 were found compliant and in FFY18, 521 plans were reviewed and 476 were found compliant. When developing the new methodology, GaDOE staff were aware that there was a risk of slippage because smaller sampling creates more volatile data. After examination of this data, we believe the smaller number of plans reviewed is the reason for the slippage. The GaDOE staff have worked extensively to improve Indicator 13 compliance. The following list provides the ongoing efforts the GaDOE staff have in place:

- Professional Learning Opportunities on Transition and Assistive Technology via webinars that are on-going throughout the year that support writing

compliant transition plans include topics such as:

- o ASPIRE Plus
- o Assistive Technology
- o Transitioning to Adulthood
- o Pre-ETS
- o Self-Determination
- o Transition Assessments
- o Vocational Rehabilitation
- o Using and accessing assistive technology (multiple tech. resources)
- Updated resources posted for school systems and families on the Transition Planning webpage of the Special Education website that include Transition Best Practices, Self-Determination Initiatives and Transition Compliance. In addition, there are recorded modules and presentations that provide Guidance for Writing Compliant Transition Plans.
- Regional and on-site technical assistance provided to LEAs that aren't 100% compliant and for school systems requesting technical assistance

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.

The expectation is that all students 14 and older have an appropriate and compliant transition plan; however, Georgia uses a sample from each school system to determine whether the school system has compliant practices regarding transition planning and services for students. Based on the size of the school system, two (2) to five (5) student names are randomly selected by the GaDOE from the Federal Child Count data reported in October each year. The selected students will be at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement. School systems will have the opportunity to self-assess the transition plans for compliance prior to submitting the plans for GaDOE review. GaDOE staff will review all plans submitted and determine compliance. For school systems that have transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities will be required. Prong 1 requires the correction of non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices and procedures regarding transition planning. Prong 2 requires the submission of additional transition plans for review. School systems with non-compliance are required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. School systems with continued non-compliance are required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determines that the transition plans have the required components for secondary transition. The GaDOE calculates the percentage of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition by dividing the number of compliant plans submitted by the total number of plans submitted including those submitted in Prong 2. The GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and a State data system

	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 yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

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)

In FFY2017 Georgia revised the sampling process for collecting Indicator 13 data. As this resulted in a change in the State's calculation methodology, the baseline was changed to reflect FFY2017 as the baseline year.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
33	33	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia uses a sample of transition plans from each school system to determine whether the school system has compliant practices regarding transition planning and services for students. Based on the size of the school system, two (2) to five (5) student names are randomly selected by the GaDOE from the Federal Child Count data reported in October each year. The selected students will be at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement. School systems will have the opportunity to self-assess the transition plans for compliance prior to submitting the plans for GaDOE review. GaDOE staff will review all plans submitted and determine compliance. For school systems that have transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities will be required. Prong 1 requires the correction of non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices and procedures regarding transition planning. Prong 2 requires the submission of additional transition plans for review. School systems with non-compliance are required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. School systems with continued non-compliance are required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determines that the transition plans have the required components for secondary transition.

Technical assistance is also provided to the school systems by GaDOE staff. In isolated instances, the GaDOE staff made personal visits to an school system to provide training. All school systems have multiple opportunities for professional learning regarding Transition Planning for students with

disabilities. A webinar series was developed for all school systems to promote compliance for Transition Planning. In addition, GaDOE developed a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offers training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, to teachers at the annual Institute Designed for Education ALL Students (IDEAS) conference and Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA).

GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 made necessary changes and that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Additionally, each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and a State data system.

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

Prong 1 requires the correction of individual non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices and procedures regarding transition planning. School systems were required to submit non-compliant plans until compliance was verified by the GaDOE. Technical assistance is also provided to the school systems by GaDOE staff. In isolated instances, the GaDOE staff made personal visits to a school system to provide training. All school systems have multiple opportunities for professional learning regarding Transition Planning for students with disabilities. A webinar series was developed for all school systems to promote compliance for Transition Planning. In addition, GaDOE developed a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offers training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference, to teachers at the annual Institute Designed for Educating ALL Students (IDEAS) conference and Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA). GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 made any necessary changes and are now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Additionally, each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY2017 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring and a State data system. The state verified that for each student determined to have non-compliant transition plan(s), a new transition plan was developed, reviewed, and determined to be compliant within one year of notification of noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 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” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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, 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.

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

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.

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.

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 should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	24.80%	24.80%	25.50%	26.25%	27.00%
A	27.23%	Data	24.78%	24.39%	26.00%	25.80%	25.95%
B	2009	Target >=	53.60%	53.60%	53.70%	53.70%	53.90%
B	51.46%	Data	53.64%	53.73%	56.07%	58.75%	59.76%
C	2009	Target >=	79.90%	79.90%	80.00%	80.00%	80.10%
C	77.08%	Data	79.95%	81.04%	78.46%	82.88%	82.92%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	27.40%	27.40%
Target B >=	54.00%	54.00%
Target C >=	80.10%	80.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	10,758
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,629
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	3,654
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)	1,073
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).	1,764

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,629	10,758	25.95%	27.40%	24.44%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6,283	10,758	59.76%	54.00%	58.40%	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)	9,120	10,758	82.92%	80.10%	84.77%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Based on the feedback provided to the State while providing technical assistance to over 300 special education directors, coordinators and transition personnel on improving postschool outcomes, fewer students indicated in their transition planning the desire to attend a 4 year college, choosing instead employment or technical college. We hypothesize that therefore, students with disabilities are not entering college due to decreased participation in dual enrollment and higher-level course work in their transition planning.
B	XXX
C	XXX

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

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.

An analysis of the response data related to youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school indicated that Georgia's response data is representative of the race/ethnicity of the students who exited and reported post-secondary activities 1 year later. All race/ethnicity groups had a less than 1% difference between the percent enrollment for race/ethnicity and the percent for the rate of response for the category.

Georgia's response data is also representative of the disability area of the students who exited and reported post-secondary activities 1 year later. The difference between the percent of exiters by disability area and the percent for the rate of response for the disability area was equal to or less than 0.1% for all areas of disability.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia has placed an emphasis upon intentional instruction in self-determination which would allow students to be able to focus on their strengths (strength-based assessments, learning and planning) to direct them towards their desired postsecondary outcome. The state is initiating training and programs to address these deficit areas. We are also working closely with other divisions within GaDOE to provide technical assistance to general education teachers, as well as, special education personnel to ensure that each student has the skills necessary to achieve their desired postsecondary outcome.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

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, targets and improvement activities, 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 not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	41
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	25

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

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education

• Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	88.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	62.70%	62.70%	62.80%	62.90%	63.00%
Data	62.71%	62.90%	64.55%	57.83%	45.83%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	63.10%	63.10%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
25	41	45.83%	63.10%	60.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

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)(ii)) 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	104
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	15
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	49

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

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is 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 of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as the state has sought and received broad stakeholder input.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2019 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following:

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district 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 Correction
- A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
- Part C, Babies Can't Wait
- Private schools or Charter school
- The Department of Juvenile Justice
- Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
- The Division of Family and Children Service
- Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support

- Parent Training and Information Center
- Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2019, November 2019 and January 2020, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

The State Director for special education conducted listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	62.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	50.00% - 70.00%
Data	63.27%	60.71%	48.53%	54.44%	63.11%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
15	49	104	63.11%	50.00%	70.00%	61.54%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

16 - 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:

Zelphine Smith-Dixon

Title:

State Director

Email:

zsmith@doe.k12.ga.us

Phone:

4049871568

Submitted on: