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Goals of the Presentation
Describe the criteria for measuring, and state the trend data for Georgia’s SPP/APR Indicators:

- Indicator 4a- Suspension/Expulsion
- Indicator 4b- Suspension/Expulsion (by race/ethnicity)
- Indicator 5- Educational Environments (school age)
- Indicator 6- Preschool Environments
- Indicator 9- Disproportionate Representation
- Indicator 10- Disproportionate Representation (Specific Disability Categories)
- Indicator 13- Secondary Transition
As we delve into more indicators of the SPP/APR ponder ........

• Why do significant discrepancy and significant disproportionality have such importance for student outcomes?

• Why are effective transition plans critical for students with disabilities?

• Why is it important to collect data on the settings in which students with disabilities receive services?
State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)
Indicators 4a & 4b – Suspension/Expulsion

Suspension & Removal from School for > 10 days

Linda Castellanos, Dawn Kemp, Alicia Mercer & Bridget Still
General Overview of Indicators 4a & 4b

Significant Discrepancy—*Discipline*

This occurs when:

1) Students with Disabilities in a Local Education Agency (LEA) are suspended out of school (OSS) greater than 10 days at a **significantly higher rate (≥ 2.0 = Rate Ratio)** than the State rate of OSS > 10 days for Students with Disabilities (**Indicator 4a**) or

2) One racial/ethnic subgroup of Students with Disabilities within a LEA has a demonstrated higher risk of being suspended out of school (OSS) greater than 10 days at a **higher rate (≥ 2.0 = Rate Ratio)** than the all Students with Disabilities State rate for OSS > 10 days. (**Indicator 4b**)
Indicator 4a

Significant Discrepancy

Students with Disabilities
Indicator 4a: Suspension/Expulsion

Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for SWD compared to the state rate of suspension and expulsions greater than 10 days.
Indicator 4a State Data

Data reported is from 2018-2019 school year
Data collected in June 2019 from Student Records

**Five (5) LEAs** were identified to have had significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities.
Indicator 4b

Significant Discrepancy

Specific Racial/Ethnic Subgroup
Indicator 4b: Suspension/Expulsion

Compliance Indicator:

Percent of districts that have:

(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))
Indicator 4b State Data

Data reported is from 2018-2019 school year
Data collected in June 2019 from Student Records

• Eight (8) LEAs had significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for a specific racial/ethnic subgroup.
  • Four (4) LEAs determined to be noncompliant based on a review of polices, practices and procedures.

**Determination made in FY20 (will be reported to OSEP in February 2021)**
Summary of Data-Indicator 4a & 4b

FY20 Indicator 4a & 4b Summary

- Indicator 4a: 5
- Indicator 4b: 8
- Indicator 4b and NC: 4
State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicators 9 & 10 – Disproportionate Representation

Linda Castellanos, Dawn Kemp, Alicia Mercer & Bridget Still
General Overview of Indicators 9 & 10

Disproportionality Area—IDENTIFICATION

This occurs when:

1) One racial/ethnic subgroup has a demonstrated higher risk of being identified as students with disabilities when compared to students from all other racial/ethnic subgroups. (Indicator 9)

   or

2) One racial/ethnic subgroup has a demonstrated higher risk of being identified as having a specific disability as defined by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) when compared to students from all other racial/ethnic subgroups. (Indicator 10)
Indicator 9

Disproportionate Representation

*Students with Disabilities*
Indicator 9

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))
Indicator 9 State Data

Data reported in 2019 – 2020
Data collected in October 2019 for Federal Child Count

• No LEAs was reported to have had a determination of disproportionate representation.
Indicator 10

Disproportionate Representation

Specific Disability Categories
Indicator 10

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))
Specific Disability Categories

- Intellectual Disabilities (all 4 levels)
- Specific Learning Disabilities
- Emotional Behavioral Disorder
- Speech or Language Impairments
- Other Health Impairments
- Autism
Indicator 10 State Data

Data reported in 2019 – 2020
Data collected in October 2019 for Federal Child Count

- **Thirty-five (35)** LEAs were identified to have had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in **specific disability categories.**

- **Seven (7)** LEAs determined to be **noncompliant** based on a review of polices, practices and procedures.

**Determination made in FY20 (will be reported to OSEP in February 2021)**
Indicator 10

FY20

Number of LEAs with Findings
Number of Noncompliant LEAs
Georgia at a Glance
Things to Ponder…

• In what specific ways can you see disproportionality being problematic for Georgia’s students?

• What tangible steps can we take to improve current determinations in our state?
Now...Why, How, What?

GaDOE Disproportionality Team
Our Purpose
Act, Think & Communicate from the INSIDE OUT!

**WHY** - Your Purpose
Your motivation? What do you believe?

**HOW** - Your Process
Specific actions taken to realize your Why

**WHAT** - Your Result
What do you do? The result of Why. Proof
Why is Disproportionality a Concern?

In some circumstances, in LEAs with disproportionate determinations, student with disabilities:

• encounter limited, less rigorous curriculum
• LEAs may not be providing equitable access to all students (includes over and under-identifying)
• have a greater risk of dropping out
• may be educated separately from typical peers
• lower expectations lead to diminished academic & post-secondary opportunities
• are often stigmatized socially contributing to social emotional challenges
• inappropriate labeling remains throughout school career

Possible Contributing Factors

- Inconsistent discipline policies and practices
- Lack of interventions
- Limited opportunities to learn in the classroom
- Inequitable evaluation practices
- Varying levels of access to educational opportunities
- Teacher expectations and misconceptions
- Implicit biases
- Absence of culturally-responsive teaching
- Insufficient family-school partnerships
State Review of Data for LEA

State makes determination of LEAs with Disproportionality

Significant Discrepancy
4a & 4b

Disproportionate Representation
9 & 10

Disproportionate LEAs MUST complete the following tasks:

Complete the disproportionality self-assessment of policies, practices and procedures and submit to GaDOE.

If non-complaint policies, practice and/or procedures led to the disproportionality, LEA must correct all findings within one year of being notified.
Compliance Review

LEA Responsibilities
• Gather stakeholder team
• Complete LEA Self Rating specific to identified area
  • Placement
  • Discipline
  • Identification
• Required to submit:
  • Completed LEA Self Rating
  • A copy of policies, practices, and procedures
  • Student records (IEPs, discipline records, eligibility reports, evaluation reports, etc.)

GaDOE Responsibilities
• Review of compliance review form by GaDOE Staff
• Required to review:
  • Compliance Review form
  • LEA policies, practices, and procedures
  • LEA student records
• Provide technical assistance, as needed
How DSESS Supports LEAs

• Technical Assistance
  • Regional Training
  • Presentations
  • Webinars
  • Access to Disproportionality Data Monitoring Tool

• Partner with Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS) to monitor and support LEAs

• Using the compliance review process as a tool to couple support with accountability
Technical Assistance - FY21

Targeted Support for Root Cause Analysis
System-focused Support
Region-focused Support
Collaboration

- Data/GO-IEP Unit
- Family Engagement & Dispute Resolution
- Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS)
Our Team Focus

• Equitable practices for all students in the State
• Decrease number of LEAs with disproportionality and decrease the number of noncompliant findings
• Increase awareness by proactively reviewing disproportionality data sources
The Bottom Line

Equitable Practices
Cultural Awareness
Root Cause Analysis
Indicator 13- Secondary Transition

College, Employment, Life
Dawn Kemp & Laurie Ponsell
Indicator 13: Postsecondary Goals for 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 service 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)).
WHEN THINKING ABOUT TRANSITION, WHAT MIGHT AN IEP TEAM LOOK AT TO DISCUSS POST-SECONDARY GOALS FOR A STUDENT WHO IS TRANSITIONING TO HIGH-SCHOOL? WHAT TYPES OF TRANSITION SERVICES MIGHT BE NEEDED TO HELP THE STUDENT MOVE TOWARDS REACHING THOSE GOALS?

WHAT ARE THE FIRST STEPS IN DETERMINING HOW TO BEGIN WRITING THE TRANSITION PLAN?
Individualized Transition Plan

- Using age-appropriate transition assessments, the team can determine the student’s interests, strengths and needs.
- Additional information can be useful in aiding the team in determining the most appropriate goals and services and supports the student will need as they begin the process of transitioning to high-school and ultimately, transitioning to college, employment and adulthood.
- Individualized Graduation Plan
- Student Interest Inventory
- Student Interview
- Parent Interview
Monitoring Indicator 13
Indicator 13 - A Look Back

Previously, Georgia’s method to collect data for Indicator 13 was to use a sample from each LEA to determine whether the LEA had compliant practices regarding transition planning and services for students. The process was completed through a state monitoring survey. Based on the size of the LEA, two (2) to five (5) student names were randomly selected by the GADOE from the Federal Child Count data reported in October each year. The selected students would be at least 16 years of age regardless of grade placement. LEAs had the opportunity to self-assess the transition plans for compliance prior to submitting the plans for GADOE review. GADOE staff reviewed all plans submitted and determined compliance.
Indicator 13-A Look Back

For LEAs that had transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities were 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. LEAs with non-compliance are required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. LEAs 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 calculated 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.
Indicator 13 for FY20

• GADOE did not use the Transition Planning Survey to monitor Transition Plans in FY20

• GADO reviewed transition plans through the FY20 Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM) cycle

• Through CFM, the same 10 transition plan components were reviewed to measure compliance for Indicator 13

• LEAs that were not monitored in the cycle received a N/A on their District Determination
# Transition Plan Components Checklist Comparison

## Transition Documentation Checklist - Previous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transition Plan Components Checklist Comparison

### Cross Functional Monitoring Checklist for Student Folder Review - Current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.</th>
<th>Transition Plan Components</th>
<th>34 C.F.R. 300.43, 340.320, 340.620</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Postsecondary outcome goal for Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Postsecondary outcome goal for Education/Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Postsecondary outcome goal for Independent Living (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Reflects steps to desired post-secondary outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Postsecondary goals based on transition assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Transition services and/or activities to facilitate movement to postsecondary outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Course of study to facilitate movement to post-school outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Student invited to meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Agency representative invited, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Parent consent received prior to inviting agency representative, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 13: FY19 Data

• 91.4% in compliance
  • 521 plans reviewed
  • 476 found to be compliant

• Data collected and reviewed: December 2018 to February 2019
Indicator 13: FY20 Data

- 91.1% in compliance
  - 326 plans reviewed
  - 297 found to be compliant

- Data collected and reviewed: November 2019 to November 2020
Transition Support and Improvement
Improving results for Indicator 13

- Professional Learning Opportunities throughout the year through virtual meetings
- On-going webinars for Transition Planning and Assistive Technology
- Updated website for easier navigation and location of information
- Regional and on-site technical assistance (TA) provided to LEAs that are non-compliant and LEAs who request TA
- Recorded modules for writing compliant transition plans posted on website
State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicators 5 & 6 – Environment

Linda Castellanos, Dawn Kemp, Alicia Mercer & Bridget Still
Exploring Environments

1) What are some of the settings in which K-12 students with disabilities can receive special education services?

2) What are the advantages and disadvantages of each setting?

3) Does it depend on the needs of the student?
Indicator 5: Education Environments (K-12)
Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 [or 5 if in K] 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))
Indicators 5 & 6 Recommendation: Establish NEW BASELINES

• WHY?

• Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has changed data collection for Indicators 5 and 6

• Significant change in data collection and data for Georgia

• Indicator 6 data has changed dramatically as a result of the change
Data Trends will continue in alignment with the new method of data collection for Indicators 5 & 6.

While Indicator 5 has not been impacted as significantly by the change as Indicator 6, both have a difference in data collection that should be reflected by new baselines.

New, realistic baselines are needed moving forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>NEW BASELINE 62.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>65.5 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>64.06</td>
<td>65.4 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>64.46</td>
<td>65.3 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>64.89</td>
<td>65.2 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator 5b- Inside the Regular Class < 40%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td><strong>NEW BASELINE 16.58</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>14 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.1 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>14.2 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>14.3 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5c- Separate Settings, Residential Settings, Hospital Homebound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>NEW BASELINE 1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.38 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.5 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.6 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.7 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is Environment Important?

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is a legal IDEA requirement

Each LEA shall have policies and procedures to ensure that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities in Georgia shall be educated with children who are not disabled. [34 C.F.R. § 300.114(a)(2)(i)]

Code: IDDF (8) (doe.k12.ga.us)
Why is Environment Important?

• Placement in the regular class setting with appropriate supports and specialized instruction enables:
  
  • Enhanced exposure to the general curriculum
  
  • Typical peer models
  
  • Higher probability of attaining a regular diploma
  
  • Social opportunities
Exploring Environments

1) What are some of the settings in which early childhood PRESCHOOL students with disabilities can receive special education services?

2) What are the advantages and disadvantages of each setting?

3) Does it depend on the needs of the student?
Indicator 6 Preschool Environments

Percent of children aged 3 through 5 (not in K) 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))
Indicators 5 & 6 NEW BASELINES

• Indicator 6 impact:

  • The number of students in the Indicator 6 collection have significantly decreased with the removal of 5-year-old K students.

  • The 5-year-old children included in Indicator 6 are likely to be in more restrictive settings.
    • 5-year-old-children are not generally served in regular pre-k lottery funded programs. This placement for a student who is 5 by Sept 1 requires an exception, which must be requested through Bright from the Start.
    • 5-year-old-children who need an additional year of pre-k will often receive the services in a separate classroom setting.

  • Another variable impacting the data for Indicator 6 is the lack of universal pre-k in Georgia.
    • Lottery funded PK programs in GA generally do not offer enough slots for all students who might benefit from this program
    • School systems often must develop separate early childhood special education programs to serve 3- to 5-year-old students
    • These programs are often more restrictive with only special education student participation.
Indicator 6a: Reg. Early Childhood Program with the Majority of Services in Reg. Early Childhood Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>New Baseline 32.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>41.76</td>
<td>46.6 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>46.4 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>42.95</td>
<td>46.2 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>43.98</td>
<td>46 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator 6b- Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>New Baseline 41.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>22.5 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td>23 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>23.5 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>23 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators 5 & 6

- Baselines should be revised to reflect the new method of data collection on Indicators 5 & 6
  - 5-year-old children in K are now included in Indicator 5 and not 6
  - 5-year-old children in pre-k continue to be included in Indicator 6
  - There is a decrease in students in Indicator 6, and an increase in more restrictive placements.
Summary of Indicators 4a, 4b, 5, 6, 9 & 10

- Indicator 4a- Met Target
- Indicator 4b- Did Not Meet Target (0%) – No Slippage
- Indicators 5 & 6- New Baselines- No Targets
- Indicator 9- Met Target
- Indicator 10- Did Not Meet Target (0%)- No Slippage
- Indicator 13- Did Not Meet Target (100%)- No Slippage
Thanks for your support