

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

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Georgia**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2022**

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

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

During FFY 2020, Georgia continued to be impacted by the COVID pandemic, and instruction was conducted in a wide variety of formats ranging from face-to-face, virtual, and hybrid in the 2020-2021 school year. The instructional formats utilized (i.e., virtual, in person, hybrid) were variable both across Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and within LEAs based upon the severity of COVID infection rates in different regions of the state and individual student health challenges. High stakes testing for all students, including students with disabilities, was resumed in the 2020-2021 school year with decreased participation. Students participating in virtual instruction were not required to report to a physical school facility for assessment participation if there were health concerns. As a result, the number of students participating in assessments was lower than in previous years. Program participation for young children in the 3- and 4-year-old age range declined due in part to parental COVID concerns. Despite these challenges, Georgia's Annual Performance Report for 2020-2021 continued to demonstrate Georgia's resilience and commitment to providing services for students with disabilities and building inclusive partnerships with families and communities.

Georgia met targets for the following SPP/APR Indicators: 4b (Significant Discrepancy), 7A (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive social-emotional outcomes), 7B (1 & 2) (Preschool Outcomes- Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills), 7C (1) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs), 8 (Parent Involvement), 9 (Disproportionate Representation), 14B (Post-School Outcomes- Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed), 14C (Post-School Outcomes Enrolled in Higher Education, or some other type of postsecondary training, Competitively Employed, or employed in some other employment), and 17 (State Systemic Improvement Plan). Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 3 (Assessment), and 6C (Early Childhood Environment - Receiving Services in the Home) were all reset to baseline level in this FFY 2020 report.

Georgia did not meet targets but had no slippage for the following Indicators: 5A (Educational Environment, Inside the regular classroom 80% or more), 5B (Educational Environment, Inside the regular classroom <40%), 5C (Educational Environment, Separate Settings), 6B (Early Childhood Environment - Receiving Majority of services in Separate Classroom, Separate School, or Residential Facility), 7A (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Positive social-emotional outcomes), 7C (2) (Preschool Outcomes- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs), 10 (Disproportionate Representation by Specific Eligibility Category), 11 (Child Find), 12 (Early Childhood Transition), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 A (Post-School Outcomes- Enrolled in Higher Education). Georgia had slippage in SPP/APR Indicators: 4A (Significant Discrepancy), 6A (Early Childhood Environment - Receiving Majority of Services in the Regular Childhood Program), 15 (Resolution Sessions), and 16 (Mediations).

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) continued to have a supportive stance in addressing the needs of students, teachers, leaders, and families in the COVID pandemic in the 2020-2021 school year. Georgia maintained a website for LEAs and parents with COVID information and resources at <https://www.georgiainsights.com/coronavirus.html>. The website contained a specific link to information regarding services for students with disabilities at <https://www.georgiainsights.com/specialeducation.html>. The Division for Special Education Services and Supports (DSESS) provided ongoing technical assistance and guidance for special education leaders, as well as, partnered with other divisions to address the needs of all leaders. On August 7, 2020, Dr. Zephine Smith-Dixon, former Georgia State Director of Special Education, conducted a COVID-related Q & A session with special education leaders at the Local Education Agency (LEA) level about the implementation of general supervision and FAPE in a variety of instructional settings. Relevant guidance was provided on numerous topics such as virtual instruction, assistive technology, extended school year, working with parents, documenting services, and FERPA adherence in a virtual environment (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Directors%20Webinars/2020-21/Lunch%20and%20Learn%20with%20Dr.%20Smith-Dixon%20ppt.pdf>).

Georgia provided LEA restart guidance regarding change of placement for students with disabilities in February 2021 at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/GaDOE%20Restart%20Guidance/GaDOE%20Restart%20Guidance%20on%20Change%20of%20Placement%20vs%20Change%20of%20Location%202-17-21.pdf>.

Compensatory services were addressed for students with disabilities at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/GaDOE%20Restart%20Guidance/Georgia%27s%20Restart%20Guidance%20%28Compensatory%20Services%29.pdf> on February 19, 2021.

There was continual communication by DSESS with LEA leaders and the provision of resources. Resources were compiled and are available at <https://www.georgiainsights.com/specialeducation.html> and [https://www.georgiainsights.com/uploads/1/2/2/2/122221993/special\\_education\\_restart\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.georgiainsights.com/uploads/1/2/2/2/122221993/special_education_restart_guidance.pdf)

Georgia has adopted the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Whole Child Framework in an effort to better align educational efforts to address the holistic needs of all students, including students with disabilities. Based on the five tenants of the Whole Child Framework, all children should be healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and challenged to learn (see <https://www.georgiainsights.com/wholechild.html>).

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Georgia received a waiver from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education related to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which waived accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Documents/ESSA/ga%20acct%20waiver%20response.pdf>). However, high stakes testing was not waived and resumed for all students, including students with disabilities, in the 2020-2021 school year. Students participating in virtual instruction were not required to report to a physical school facility for assessment participation if there were health concerns. As a result, the number of students participating in assessments was significantly lower than in previous years for all students, including students with disabilities. More specific information about the impact of COVID on individual SPP/APR Indicators, including Assessment Indicator 3 A-D, is located in the narratives for those Indicators.

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

223

#### General Supervision System:

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

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

The DSESS provided appropriate accountability to ensure that LEAs complied with federal regulations. Fidelity of compliant practices was enforced by using a tiered monitoring system that enabled the Division staff to "monitor" all LEAs every year. The DSESS monitored each LEA every year through a tiered monitoring system to ensure timely identification and correction of any identified noncompliance. At each tier, the DSESS conducted a systematic collection and analysis of data to inform compliant practices and improve results. The State provided increased or more intensive supports based on the analysis of data. An additional critical component of Georgia's continuous improvement monitoring is Cross Functional Monitoring (CFM), which is conducted using a four-year cycle. The CFM process is intensive and examines all components of a system's implementation of IDEA. The State monitors at least sixty LEAs each year in the process allowing all LEAs to be reviewed within the four-year cycle. The closure of LEAs due to COVID in the 2019-2020 school year impacted the CFM process in 2020-2021. Due to the challenges of COVID in 2019-2020, the CFM process for that year had to be completed in 2020-2021 for LEAs in that yearly cycle. The standard schedule resumed beginning in 2021-2022.

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Example of Monitoring Process -**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Technical Assistance System:**

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

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

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

During FFY20, monthly Technical Assistance (TA) was provided to all LEAs through Monthly Special Education Directors Webinars which can be accessed at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Directors%27-Webinars.aspx>. The webinars provided timely information regarding topics such as Assistive Technology, English Learners and Students with Disabilities, IEP Development, and Extended School Year Services.

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

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

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

#### **Professional Development System:**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

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

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly

available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

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

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

338

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

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

Beginning with the SAP meeting on May 6, 2021, Georgia shared a cohesive framework for SPP/APR indicators designed to foster greater involvement in stakeholder engagement, including parent engagement, in the areas of target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. In the framework, the Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following clusters to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback: Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, and 14), Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10), Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12), Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal, and Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3). The SAP had 37 parent members and they were provided with an opportunity to participate in a work group session on September 2, 2021. On September 2, 2021, each SAP member, including parent members, participated in one of the cluster groups. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized presentation format. Prior to facilitating the cluster group, each DSESS facilitator participated in a training session on August 5, 2021, and led a DSESS cluster group on August 11, 2021. All DSESS staff selected a cluster group for the August 11, 2021 session based upon job role and interest. The process and intent in the August 11, 2021 session was the same as that described below for the September 2, 2021 SAP meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

There were 20 virtual meeting opportunities to provide feedback on the SPP/APR and initiatives associated with improving outcomes for students. In addition, SAP meetings provided information about specially designed instruction, Georgia's dyslexia initiative, addressing disproportionality, and SSIP initiatives to combat dropping out of school. All presentations provided SAP members with resources for additional information on the implementation of these instructional initiatives as well as the progress of their implementation. Presentations to SAP also provided details of the monitoring of initiatives that were designed to improve student outcomes. All presentations regarding the SPP/APR clearly defined its Indicators, timeframe, and measurement to enhance stakeholder capacity to provide advisement. Parents also had the opportunity to participate in the online SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 publicly posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). A companion document, Target Setting for the SPP/APR, was also provided at the same url to enable informed survey participation. The document provided longitudinal data and information on each Results Indicator in the survey.

COVID concerns prohibited in person meetings for the development of the SPP/APR 2020-2025. Prior to COVID, SAP meetings were conducted in person. Stakeholder feedback opportunities were greatly expanded in 2020-2021 with the increased use of virtual meeting options.

#### **Soliciting Public Input:**

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

SPP/APR information including proposed targets, SPP/APR Survey, and recorded presentations were publicly posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). Presentations on the website provided a description of the SPP/APR, Indicator data, APR progress, and initiatives used to improve outcomes. Each presentation had an online feedback survey addressing specific Indicators. The SPP/APR Survey for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR was available in November 2021 for public participation. A companion document titled Target Setting for the SPP/APR was posted with the survey to enable a review of all longitudinal data to inform participation. The proposed targets were posted for public comments beginning December 7, 2021.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

The document, Target Setting for the SPP/APR, posted in November 2021 on the SPP/APR website (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx)) contained data analysis for public review and enabled an evaluation of longitudinal information. Georgia updates information regarding the SPP/APR at this location. The SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey was also available at this location for public input.

The results of target setting for the SPP/APR 2020-2025 were made available on December 7, 2021, for public comment, with the exception of Indicator 3 data added on January 18, 2022. The SAP website (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Advisory-Panel-%28SAP%29.aspx>) provides meeting minutes and agendas for each month's SAP meeting. The minutes outline the improvement strategies and instructional initiatives being implemented in Georgia for students with disabilities. The SPP/APR website will expand the public posting of presentations and documents that provide improvement strategies for students with disabilities.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

The GaDOE provides data regarding students with disabilities in our state. The Annual Performance Report is posted on the Special Education webpage at the following link: [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). Georgia's APR is available for the current and previous years. LEA public Annual Performance Reports are available for public viewing using the following link: [https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/\\_Layout.html](https://spedpublic.gadoe.org/Views/Shared/_Layout.html). The user must enter the zip code for the LEA or type the name of the LEA they are interested in viewing.

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

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

**Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Intro - OSEP Response**

**Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	73.46%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	54.00%	54.50%	57.60%	57.58%	62.27%
Data	54.33%	56.59%	56.27%	61.11%	62.94%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	73.46%	74.46%	75.46%	76.46%	77.46%	78.46%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3)

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	11,171
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	307
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,600

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma</b>	<b>Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
11,171	14,078	62.94%	73.46%	79.35%	Met target	N/A

**Graduation Conditions**

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

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

Georgia is reporting data from the 2019-2020 school year. This represents lagged data based on OSEP's requirement to report data as submitted in SY 2019-20 FS009 Students Exiting Special Education.

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

NO

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

Georgia's graduation rate for SY 2019-2020 was significantly inflated due to mitigation measures for COVID based state-wide school closures in Georgia. A governor's order closed all in-person instruction beginning March 16, 2020 and eventually extending through the remainder of the school year. In an effort to mitigate the impact of COVID, Georgia's State Board of Education provided waivers on April 3, 2020 to mitigate the impact of COVID on graduation (see [https://www.georgiainsights.com/uploads/1/2/2/2/122221993/sboe\\_waivers\\_for\\_leas\\_-\\_gadoe\\_guidance\\_-\\_rev\\_4-3-2020.pdf](https://www.georgiainsights.com/uploads/1/2/2/2/122221993/sboe_waivers_for_leas_-_gadoe_guidance_-_rev_4-3-2020.pdf) ). Guidance provided with the waiver indicated that students were not to be penalized for events beyond their control and held back from progression to the next grade or graduation. The waivers included all state assessments and seat time requirements to earn credit. As a result of the circumstances, Georgia's graduation rate increased by almost 7% percentage points in SY 2019-2020 when compared to prior years calculated with the 618 Annual Event Graduation rate mandated beginning FFY20.

Based upon stakeholder feedback and an examination of longitudinal data, Georgia is requesting to set our baseline using data from the 2018-2019 school year calculated with the 618 Annual Event rate of 73.46%, rather than the 79.35% rate from FFY2020. The graduation data from 2018-2019 is much more representative of Georgia's regular diploma graduation trend data for students with disabilities (i.e., 2 to 3% percentage points increase per year).

The graduation rates shown in the Historical Data Chart (2015-2019) were calculated for the SPP/APR using the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate calculation, which was previously an option. As a result, the rates shown are not comparable to the rate of 79.35% shown for FFY2020. The current rate is calculated using the required 618 data Annual Event calculation for exiters. The FFY2019 rate, converted and used for proposed baseline, is illustrative of the data that would be reflected in the chart if all rates were converted. The Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate calculation and Annual Event Rate calculation have different measurement groups (i.e., 9th-12th grade v. 14-21 years of age) and criteria which eliminates comparability.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using section 618 exiting data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 618 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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 FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

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:

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

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	23.56%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	5.80%	5.70%	5.60%	5.50%	5.40%
Data	5.60%	5.60%	5.74%	5.47%	5.13%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	23.56%	22.56%	21.56%	20.56%	19.56%	18.56%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

sought and received broad stakeholder input. Georgia greatly expanded the outreach for broad and diverse input with the 2020-2025 SPP/APR Package. Many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process were provided in the development of the SPP/APR FFY2020. The primary stakeholder group, the State Advisory Panel (SAP), which meets monthly is comprised of the following members:

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

#### **Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 1

#### **Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	11,171
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	307
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,600

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,600	14,078	5.13%	23.56%	18.47%	Met target	N/A

#### 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.

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

Georgia's dropout rate for SY 2019-2020 was significantly lower due to mitigation measures for COVID based state-wide school closures in Georgia. A governor's order closed all in-person instruction beginning March 16, 2020 and eventually extending through the remainder of the school year. In an effort to mitigate the impact of COVID, Georgia's State Board of Education waivers were issued on April 3, 2020 (see [https://www.georgiainsights.com/uploads/1/2/2/2/122221993/sboe\\_waivers\\_for\\_leas\\_-\\_gdoe\\_guidance\\_-\\_rev\\_4-3-2020.pdf](https://www.georgiainsights.com/uploads/1/2/2/2/122221993/sboe_waivers_for_leas_-_gdoe_guidance_-_rev_4-3-2020.pdf)). Guidance provided with the waiver indicated that students were not to be penalized for events beyond their control and held back from progression to the next grade or graduation. The waivers included all state assessments and seat time requirements to earn credit. While the waivers did not explicitly state information about dropouts, the waiver of seat time and assessments improved the probability of graduation and discouraged student's from dropping out. As a result of the circumstances, Georgia's dropout rate decreased by over 5% percentage points in SY 2019-2020 when compared to prior years calculated with the 618 Exitors rate. Georgia began using the calculation rate for exitors based upon 618 data rather than the calculation previously used. The Exitors rate better aligns with the Annual Event graduation rate calculation used for Indicator 1 Graduation.

Based upon stakeholder feedback and an examination of longitudinal data, Georgia is requesting to set our baseline using data from the 2018-2019 school year recalculated with the 618 Data Exitors Dropout rate (Option 1) of 23.56%, rather than the 18.47% Exitors Dropout rate (Option 1) from 2019-2020 school year. The dropout data from 2018-2019 is much more representative of Georgia's typical dropout trend data for students with disabilities (i.e., 2 to 3% percentage points decrease per year).

The dropout rates shown in the Historical Data Chart with data from 2015-2019 were calculated using the Indicator 2, Option 2 dropout rate calculation (i.e., 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) which was a different calculation than Indicator 2, Option 1 (i.e., use same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009 Exitors). As a result, the rates shown are not comparable to the rate of 18.47% shown for FFY2020. The FFY2020 rate (school year 2019-2020) is calculated using the 618 data Exitors rate (Option 1). The 2018-2019 school year, FFY2019 rate, converted and used for proposed baseline, is illustrative of the data that would be reflected if all rates were converted. The dropout rate calculations for options 1 and 2 of this Indicator have different measurement groups and criteria which eliminates comparability.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## **2 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using section 618 exiting data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly

available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	18,656	19,737	14,430
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,804	1,228	911
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	10,468	9,849	7,003
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,250	1,416	1,140

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	18,546	19,911	18,993
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	2,787	1,245	1,438
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	10,387	9,587	8,962
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1,236	1,410	1,131

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

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14,522	18,656		95.00%	77.84%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	12,493	19,737		95.00%	63.30%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	9,054	14,430		95.00%	62.74%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14,410	18,546		95.00%	77.70%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	12,242	19,911		95.00%	61.48%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	11,531	18,993		95.00%	60.71%	N/A	N/A

## Regulatory Information

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

## Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Georgia received a waiver from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education related to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which waived accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Documents/ESSA/ga%20acct%20waiver%20response.pdf> ). However, high stakes testing was not waived and resumed for all students, including students with disabilities, in the 2020-2021 school year. Students participating in virtual instruction were not required to report to a physical school facility for assessment participation if there were health concerns. As a result, the number of students participating in assessments was significantly lower than previous years for all students, including students with disabilities. Of all the Indicators in the SPP/APR, Assessment was by far the most adversely impacted by COVID. Georgia has historically had remarkable success in maintaining 95% participation in high stakes testing. The decreased participation rates for 2020-2021 were a direct result of COVID. The participation rates for this are not a valid reflection of the typical participation rates.

Georgia's baseline for this Indicator is being reset for FFY 2020 due to OSEP's changes to the measurement for the Indicator (i.e., different grade groups than prior SPP/APR 4th, 8th, and high school v. 3rd – 8th, and high school). Georgia will use the data from FFY 2020 because it is reflective of the current level of participation with the impact of COVID. Georgia has elected to set a 95% target in alignment with high expectations for students with disabilities, to encourage participation, and to reflect pre-COVID rates.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

## 3A - Required Actions

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	12.77%	14.77%	16.77%	18.77%	20.77%	22.77%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	9.17%	11.77%	13.17%	15.17%	17.17%	19.17%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	5.50%	7.50%	9.50%	11.50%	13.50%	15.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	18.93%	20.93%	22.93%	24.93%	26.93%	28.93%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	7.91%	9.91%	11.91%	13.91%	15.91%	17.91%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	5.69%	7.69%	9.69%	11.69%	13.69%	15.69%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

## **FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

### **Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### **Date:**

03/03/2022

### **Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	13,272	11,077	7,914
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,062	373	96
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	633	643	339

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	13,174	10,832	10,400
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,391	332	175
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,103	525	417

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,695	13,272		12.77%	12.77%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,016	11,077		9.17%	9.17%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	435	7,914		5.50%	5.50%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,494	13,174		18.93%	18.93%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	857	10,832		7.91%	7.91%	N/A	N/A

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	592	10,400		5.69%	5.69%	N/A	N/A

## Regulatory Information

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

## Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Georgia received a waiver from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education related to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which waived accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Documents/ESSA/ga%20acct%20waiver%20response.pdf>). However, high stakes testing was not waived and resumed for all students, including students with disabilities, in the 2020-2021 school year. Students participating in virtual instruction were not required to report to a physical school facility for assessment participation if there were health concerns. Of all the Indicators in the SPP/APR, Assessment was by far the most adversely impacted by COVID. Results were based upon a smaller participation group and future assessment results will have to be carefully evaluated to determine if new baselines are required.

Indicator 3B, proficiency rate for students assessed against grade level achievement standards, required a new baseline for FFY 2020 because of measurement group changes required by OSEP on Indicator 3. Specifically, the results of students with IEPs assessed against grade level achievement standards (Indicator 3B) were disaggregated from the results of students with IEPs being assessed against alternate standards (Indicator 3C). The grade levels also differ and now include 4th, 8th, and high school grade levels rather than 3rd through 8th and high school grade levels.

While the COVID impact is undeniable, the instructional needs of students with disabilities are also apparent. As such, DSESS is aware that the keys to increasing the achievement of students with disabilities is increasing the efficacy of their teachers and instruction. Georgia is aggressively implementing instructional initiatives and enhancing existing initiatives supporting the teachers of students with disabilities. The Georgia DSESS is currently implementing explicit multi-sensory reading instruction training for the teachers of students with disabilities (see [https://or2.gadoe.org/gadoe/items/08cfba08-a563-4274-bd20-d89719d1a287/1/viewcontent/36c831db-9fc3-4b3b-acbc-95593925d6fa?\\_sl.t=true](https://or2.gadoe.org/gadoe/items/08cfba08-a563-4274-bd20-d89719d1a287/1/viewcontent/36c831db-9fc3-4b3b-acbc-95593925d6fa?_sl.t=true)). DSESS is also focusing upon the use of specially designed instruction (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx)). The use of high leverage practices are also a key element to address the needs of the teachers of students with disabilities (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/HighLeveragePracticesSpEd.aspx>).

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

## 3B - Required Actions

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	66.00%	66.00%	68.00%	68.00%	70.00%	70.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	82.77%	82.77%	84.77%	84.77%	86.77%	86.77%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	72.19%	72.19%	74.19%	74.19%	76.19%	76.19%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	58.98%	58.98%	60.98%	60.98%	62.98%	62.98%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	66.52%	66.52%	68.52%	68.52%	70.52%	70.52%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	66.40%	66.40%	68.40%	68.40%	70.40%	70.40%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly

available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,250	1,416	1,140
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	825	1,172	823

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	1,236	1,410	1,131
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	729	938	751

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	825	1,250		66.00%	66.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,172	1,416		82.77%	82.77%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	823	1,140		72.19%	72.19%	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	729	1,236		58.98%	58.98%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	938	1,410		66.52%	66.52%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	751	1,131		66.40%	66.40%	N/A	N/A

### Regulatory Information

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

### Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Georgia received a waiver from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education related to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which waived accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Documents/ESSA/ga%20acct%20waiver%20response.pdf> ). However, high stakes testing was not waived and resumed for all students, including students with disabilities, in the 2020-2021 school year. Results were based upon a smaller participation group and future assessment results will have to be carefully evaluated to determine if new baselines are required in the future. Indicator 3C, proficiency rate for students assessed against alternate achievement standards, required a new baseline for FFY 2020 because of measurement group changes required by OSEP on Indicator 3. Specifically, the results of students with IEPs assessed against alternate standards were disaggregated from the results of students with IEPs being assessed against grade level achievement standards (Indicator 3B). The grade levels assessed also differ and now include 4th, 8th, and high school rather than 3rd through 8th, and high school.

While the COVID impact is undeniable, the instructional needs of students with disabilities are also apparent. As such, DSESS is aware that the keys to increasing the achievement of students with disabilities is increasing the efficacy of their teachers and instruction. Georgia is aggressively implementing instructional initiatives and enhancing existing initiatives supporting the teachers of students with disabilities. The Georgia DSESS is currently implementing explicit multi-sensory reading instruction training for the teachers of students with disabilities (see [https://or2.gadoe.org/gadoe/items/08cfba08-a563-4274-bd20-d89719d1a287/1/viewcontent/36c831db-9fc3-4b3b-acbc-95593925d6fa?\\_sl.t=true](https://or2.gadoe.org/gadoe/items/08cfba08-a563-4274-bd20-d89719d1a287/1/viewcontent/36c831db-9fc3-4b3b-acbc-95593925d6fa?_sl.t=true) ). DSESS is also focusing upon the use of specially designed instruction (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx) ). The use of high leverage practices are also a key element to address the needs of the teachers of students with disabilities (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/HighLeveragePracticesSpEd.aspx> ).

### 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

### 3C - Required Actions

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

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

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	23.89	21.89	19.89	17.89	15.89	13.89
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	32.01	30.01	28.01	26.01	24.01	22.01
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	24.16	22.16	20.16	18.16	16.16	14.16
Math	A <=	Grade 4	24.22	22.22	20.22	18.22	16.22	14.22
Math	B <=	Grade 8	24.01	22.01	20.01	18.01	16.01	14.01
Math	C <=	Grade HS	15.96	13.96	11.96	9.96	7.96	5.96

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

## **FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

### **Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	96,745	83,495	65,130
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,272	11,077	7,914
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	33,277	32,771	18,384
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,193	1,614	930
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,062	373	96
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	633	643	339

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	96,047	80,806	74,649
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,174	10,832	10,400
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37,876	24,463	15,173
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,565	1,328	993
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,391	332	175
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,103	525	417

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12.77%	36.66%		23.89	23.89	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	9.17%	41.18%		32.01	32.01	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	5.50%	29.65%		24.16	24.16	N/A	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.93%	43.15%		24.22	24.22	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	7.91%	31.92%		24.01	24.01	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	5.69%	21.66%		15.96	15.96	N/A	N/A

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

Georgia received a waiver from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education related to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which waived accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Documents/ESSA/ga%20acct%20waiver%20response.pdf> ). However, high stakes testing was not waived and resumed for all students, including students with disabilities, in the 2020-2021 school year. Of all the Indicators in the SPP/APR, Assessment was by far the most adversely impacted by COVID. Results were based upon a smaller participation group and future assessment results will have to be carefully evaluated to determine if new baselines are required.

Indicator 3D, proficiency gap for students with IEPs assessed against grade level achievement standards and all students assessed on grade level achievement standards, required a new baseline for FFY 2020 because it is a new indicator component.

While the COVID impact is undeniable, the instructional needs of students with disabilities are also apparent. As such, DSESS is aware that the keys to increasing the achievement of students with disabilities is increasing the efficacy of their teachers and instruction. Georgia is aggressively implementing instructional initiatives and enhancing existing initiatives supporting the teachers of students with disabilities. The Georgia DSESS is currently implementing explicit multi-sensory reading instruction training for the teachers of students with disabilities (see [https://lor2.gadoe.org/gadoe/items/08cfba08-a563-4274-bd20-d89719d1a287/1/viewcontent/36c831db-9fc3-4b3b-acbc-95593925d6fa?\\_sl.t=true](https://lor2.gadoe.org/gadoe/items/08cfba08-a563-4274-bd20-d89719d1a287/1/viewcontent/36c831db-9fc3-4b3b-acbc-95593925d6fa?_sl.t=true) ). DSESS is also focusing upon the use of specially designed instruction (see [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-\(SDI\).aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Specially-Designed-Instruction-(SDI).aspx) ). The use of high leverage practices is also a key element to address the needs of the teachers of students with disabilities (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/HighLeveragePracticesSpEd.aspx> ).

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

**3D - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable).

If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	18.52%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	18.52%	17.50%	16.50%	15.50%	15.50%
Data	18.52%	18.52%	57.14%	11.76%	35.71%

## Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	35.71%	30.21%	27.21%	24.21%	21.21%	18.21%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants

were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

209

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5	7	35.71%	35.71%	71.43%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Georgia's data while reliable, valid, and complete for Indicator 4A was impacted by COVID in the 2019-2020 school year. The use of virtual instruction for approximately 3 months in the 2019-2020 school year was a factor in slippage for 4A. Virtual instruction led to an overall decrease in the number of students with OSS assignments >10 days. OSS assignments >10 days decreased by almost 25% from 1,142 in 2018-2019 to 868 in 2019-2020. As a result, the calculation of 4A was highly sensitive to OSS assignments. There were very few LEAs (7) that met the minimum n/cell size and (5) had significant discrepancy. All of these LEAs were larger LEAs with > 1,000 students with disabilities. Unfortunately, 5 of the 7 LEAs met the risk ratio threshold of 2.0 for 2 consecutive years, which mathematically caused a dramatic increase in the percentage determined significantly discrepant leading to slippage. There is a lack of stability in the percentages for this Indicator ranging from 11.76% to 57.14% and most recently 71.43%.

Subsequent analysis for the 5 LEAs with significant discrepancy, indicates that all 5 of the discrepant LEAs made progress in the 2020-2021 school year and none will be significantly discrepant in the next SPP/APR report.

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

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

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

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

Methodology: The percentage of LEAs with a significant discrepancy was determined including only for LEAs that had >= 10 students with disabilities suspended Out of School (OSS) >10 days (cell size) and at least 30 children with disabilities cumulatively enrolled (n size). There were 7 LEAs that met both criteria. Of the 7 LEAs included for analysis, there were 5 that met the rate ratio of >= 2.0 for two consecutive years.

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

COVID did not impact the collection, reliability, validity, or completeness of Indicator 4A.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

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

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

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

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

In Section 2 of the Self-Rating LEAs evaluated legal adherence to discipline rules for students with disabilities by selecting Yes or No to items such as: a) "The LEA has written policies, procedures, and practices that are compliant with the Discipline Rule," b) The LEA provides professional learning

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

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

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

- 1) Does the student's IEP include behavior goals?
- 2) Does the student have a BIP including positive behavioral interventions and supports?
- 3) Did the IEP team review and revise the IEP to address student behavior and concerns surrounding ISS, OSS and/or behavior referrals?
- 4) How many OSS days were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?
- 5) How many days ISS were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?
- 6) Did the "removal" constitute a change of placement based upon the Discipline Rule?
- 7) In the occurrence of ISS, which of the following took place? The student: a) was afforded the opportunity to continue to appropriately participate in the general curriculum. b) continued to receive the services specified in his/her IEP. c) continued to participate with nondisabled children to the extent he/she would have in his/her current placement. d) None of the above

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

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

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

#### FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE completed a review of all LEAs that met the discrepancy criteria. Five LEAs were determined to be significantly discrepant with policies, practices and procedures which contributed to the discrepancy and were not legally compliant. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and full implementation of regulatory requirements. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of IEPs, including BIPs.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review and the Self-Rating.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 1 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (prong 1 data) came into compliance.
- 6) LEAs submitted (through SE Applications) a GaDOE selected sample of new student data to substantiate systemic correction and implementation of regulatory requirements.
- 7) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. The Prong 2 review of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance based on the State's review of updated data within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 2 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 2 data came into compliance.

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

The Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE completed a review of all LEAs that met the discrepancy criteria. Five LEAs were determined to be significantly discrepant with policies, practices and procedures which contributed to the discrepancy and were not legally compliant. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and full implementation of regulatory requirements. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of IEPs, including BIPs.

- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review and the Self-Rating.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 1 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (prong 1 data) came into compliance.
- 6) LEAs submitted (through SE Applications) a GaDOE selected sample of new student data to substantiate systemic correction and implementation of regulatory requirements.
- 7) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. The Prong 2 review of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance based on the State's review of updated data within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 2 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 2 data came into compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State's FFY 2020 data represent slippage from the FFY 2019 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2020 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	5.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	5.00%	18.18%	15.38%	28.57%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

204

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
10	0	12	28.57%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

YES

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

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

Methodology: The number of LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity was determined using only LEAs that had both one subgroup >= 10 students with disabilities suspended Out of School (OSS) >10 days in a specific racial/ethnic subgroup (cell size) and the 30 children with disabilities in the same ethnic or racial subgroup cumulatively enrolled in the LEA. There were 12 LEAs that met the criteria and comprised the number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size. Of the 12 LEAs meeting the minimum cell and n size, 10 met the rate ratio of >= 2.0 for two consecutive years and were classified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

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

COVID did not impact the collection, reliability, validity, or completeness of Indicator 4B.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

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

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

- o if students removed greater than ten days were able to continue to receive services
- o if the local school system conducted a manifestation determination meeting to determine if the behavior was the result of the disability; and

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

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

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

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

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

- 1) Does the student’s IEP include behavior goals?
- 2) Does the student have a BIP including positive behavioral interventions and supports?
- 3) Did the IEP team review and revise the IEP to address student behavior and concerns surrounding ISS, OSS and/or behavior referrals?
- 4) How many OSS days were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?
- 5) How many days ISS were accumulated for the 2021-2022 school year?
- 6) Did the “removal” constitute a change of placement based upon the Discipline Rule?
- 7) In the occurrence of ISS, which of the following took place? The student: a) was afforded the opportunity to continue to appropriately participate in the general curriculum. b) continued to receive the services specified in his/her IEP. c) continued to participate with nondisabled children to the extent he/she would have in his/her current placement. d) None of the above

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

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

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

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE completed a review of all LEAs that met the discrepancy criteria. Four LEAs were determined to be significantly discrepant with policies, practices and procedures which contributed to the discrepancy and were not legally compliant. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and full implementation of regulatory requirements. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of IEPs, including BIPs.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review and the Self-Rating.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 1 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (prong 1 data) came into compliance.
- 6) LEAs submitted (through SE Applications) a GaDOE selected sample of new student data to substantiate systemic correction and implementation of regulatory requirements.
- 7) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. The Prong 2 review of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance based on the State’s review of updated data within

one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 2 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 2 data came into compliance.

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

The Results Driven Accountability Unit at GaDOE completed a review of all LEAs that met the discrepancy criteria. Four LEAs were determined to be significantly discrepant with policies, practices and procedures which contributed to the discrepancy and were not legally compliant. The LEAs received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the date of notification. Each LEA with noncompliance was advised of the required procedure to correct both individual cases of noncompliance and full implementation of regulatory requirements. The procedure for individual cases of noncompliance and the implementation of regulatory requirements were interconnected and included:

- 1) GaDOE provided technical assistance webinars to LEAs on the correct implementation of IEPs, including BIPs.
- 2) LEAs and GaDOE jointly developed, and LEAs submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GaDOE through the State secured data application (SE Applications) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).
- 3) LEAs, with guidance from GaDOE, revised and submitted policies, practices and procedures which required revision based upon the GaDOE review and the Self-Rating.
- 4) LEAs submitted correction of each individual case of noncompliance through the State secured data application (SE Applications), unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEAs, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.
- 5) GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 1 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the individual cases of noncompliance as well as policies, procedures, and practices (prong 1 data) came into compliance.
- 6) LEAs submitted (through SE Applications) a GaDOE selected sample of new student data to substantiate systemic correction and implementation of regulatory requirements.
- 7) GaDOE verified the correction of noncompliance and implementation of regulatory requirements through a standardized protocol which included a review of new student files, implementation of updated professional learning, and the implementation of updated supervision and monitoring plans. The Prong 2 review of compliant practices and procedures to support systemic correction demonstrated that the LEAs were implementing the specific regulatory requirements that were cited previously as noncompliant and achieved 100% compliance based on the State’s review of updated data within one year of the documented noncompliance. GaDOE verified and approved that the noncompliant prong 2 data was addressed with evidence of correction of noncompliance. State staff reviewed and substantiated that the LEA prong 2 data came into compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	65.20%	65.30%	65.40%	65.50%	
A	62.73%	Data	64.89%	64.46%	64.06%	63.04%	62.73%
B	2019	Target <=	14.30%	14.20%	14.10%	14.00%	
B	16.58%	Data	15.04%	15.11%	15.20%	16.26%	16.58%
C	2019	Target <=	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%	1.38%	
C	1.48%	Data	2.07%	1.97%	1.77%	1.54%	1.48%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	62.73%	63.73%	64.73%	65.73%	66.73%	67.73%
Target B <=	16.58%	16.58%	16.08%	15.58%	15.08%	15.08%
Target C <=	1.48%	1.48%	1.38%	1.38%	1.28%	1.28%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	213,272
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	133,094

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	36,609
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	2,325
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	337
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	397

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.  
NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	133,094	213,272	62.73%	62.73%	62.41%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	36,609	213,272	16.58%	16.58%	17.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,059	213,272	1.48%	1.48%	1.43%	Met target	No Slippage

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

COVID did not impact the validity, reliability, or completeness of this indicator.

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

#### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	46.00%	46.20%	46.40%	46.60%	
A	Data	43.98%	42.95%	41.94%	41.76%	32.54%
B	Target <=	23.00%	23.50%	23.00%	22.50%	
B	Data	24.65%	25.82%	27.44%	29.26%	41.32%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

## Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	32.54%	32.54%	33.54%	34.54%	35.54%	37.54%
Target B <=	41.32%	41.32%	40.32%	39.32%	38.32%	37.32%

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.63%	1.63%	1.53%	1.53%	1.43%	1.33%

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	2,848	5,426	1,074	9,348
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	537	1,776	432	2,745
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,389	2,127	383	3,899
b2. Number of children attending separate school	10	19	6	35
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	63	79	10	152

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

NO

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	2,745	9,348	32.54%	32.54%	29.36%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	3,934	9,348	41.32%	41.32%	42.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Home	152	9,348		1.63%	1.63%	N/A	N/A

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

There was an overall decrease of 1,923 children included in Indicator 6 from 11,271 in FFY 2019 to 9,348 in FFY 2020. The number of students in the Indicator 6 collection have significantly decreased with the removal of 5-year-old K students to Indicator 5. The decrease in Indicator 6 has disproportionately impacted 6A. Prior to the change, there were 7,792 children served in 6A in FFY 2018. After the change in FFY 2019, there were 3,668 students served in 6A compared to 2,745 in FFY 2020. Parents of young children were also hesitant to send very young children to school or have providers in the home setting due to COVID concerns which decreased enrollment. The availability of general education settings was also a factor. Georgia does not have universal preschool for 3 and 4-year-old children and many community options (i.e., daycare centers, community pre-k) were unavailable due to COVID. LEAs were challenged to find a regular early childhood program settings for young children, especially those who were 3-years old.

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

COVID did not impact the collection, reliability, validity, or completeness of Indicator 6.

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State has established a baseline for Indicator B6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	78.50%	78.50%	78.60%	78.60%	80.00%
A1	68.70%	Data	80.32%	78.46%	79.75%	80.53%	80.52%
A2	2008	Target >=	61.60%	61.70%	61.80%	62.00%	62.00%

A2	57.10%	Data	65.58%	64.30%	62.01%	62.16%	54.86%
B1	2008	Target >=	81.20%	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%	82.00%
B1	63.90%	Data	83.05%	82.49%	82.58%	83.38%	82.16%
B2	2008	Target >=	37.00%	37.10%	37.20%	37.30%	45.00%
B2	24.90%	Data	48.53%	48.62%	47.44%	48.08%	44.34%
C1	2008	Target >=	77.70%	77.90%	78.00%	78.00%	80.00%
C1	71.20%	Data	80.43%	78.55%	79.74%	80.56%	80.08%
C2	2008	Target >=	71.70%	71.90%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
C2	65.70%	Data	74.85%	81.58%	71.04%	71.60%	65.01%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
Target A2 >=	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%
Target B2 >=	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	51.00%
Target C1 >=	81.00%	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
Target C2 >=	72.00%	72.00%	72.10%	72.20%	72.20%	72.30%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to

allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

6,291

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	91	1.45%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	572	9.09%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,164	34.40%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,715	27.26%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,749	27.80%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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>	3,879	4,542	80.52%	81.00%	85.40%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,464	6,291	54.86%	63.00%	55.06%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	80	1.27%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	587	9.33%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,609	41.47%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,274	36.15%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	741	11.78%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,883	5,550	82.16%	83.00%	87.98%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	3,015	6,291	44.34%	46.00%	47.93%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	91	1.45%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	454	7.22%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,677	26.66%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,810	28.77%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,259	35.91%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who	3,487	4,032	80.08%	81.00%	86.48%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
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>							
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,069	6,291	65.01%	72.00%	64.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

COVID did not impact the reliability, validity, or completeness of data for this indicator.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

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

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

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

- The Department of Corrections
- Colleges/universities that prepare special education and related services personnel

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	88.50%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	45.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	
Data	49.00%	69.00%	71.00%	73.00%	88.50%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=	88.60%	88.60%	88.60%	89.60%	90.60%	91.60%
--------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
30,704	34,037	88.50%	88.60%	90.21%	Met target	No Slippage

**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 2020-2021 school year, Georgia used an online survey to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirements. All families of children with disabilities had the opportunity to participate in the survey, including parents of preschool students. Parents were all offered the same survey regardless of the grade level of the student allowing the analysis procedures to be valid and reliable. Paper copies were also available upon request. The survey was also available online in Spanish. The survey is available for participation online to all parents of children with disabilities age 3-21 in Georgia beginning in January each year and ending May 31st each year. The survey is publicized by each school system and the GaDOE so that all parents of children with disabilities including parents of children in preschool may respond to the survey. The data from the parents of preschool children is included with the data reported for all parent responses.

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

222,260

**Percentage of respondent parents**

15.31%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate		15.31%

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

The response rate in Georgia for FFY 2020 has increased by almost 5 percentage points over the FFY 2019 response rate. In FFY 2019 the response rate was 10.9% with 24,492 respondents out of 225,610 possible respondents (based on the October 1 Child Count). The State will continue to conduct webinars, provide training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE), and provide information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation. Data will also be shared with Parent to Parent, Georgia's OSEP funded parent organization. Training from the GaDOE will focus on the importance of high participation and use of the parent survey. Strategies will be shared to encourage high participation and participation representative of the student enrollment. Strategies include providing technology at IEP meetings, conferences, PTA meetings and student events at the school. School systems will be able, through the state's portal, to analyze real time survey response data by school to determine where to focus efforts for increased participation to ensure response data is more representative of the demographics of the population. School systems will be encouraged to share participation data with principals during the data collection process to solicit support, enlisting the assistance of Parent Mentors to publicize and encourage participation, and partnering successful school systems with neighboring school systems that struggle with low participation rates. Our State's Parent training and Information Center (PTI), Parent to Parent of Georgia, publicizes the survey and assists parents with questions regarding their participation. Starting in the 2019-2020 school year, additional technical assistance for families was provided by the GaDOE Special Education Help Desk. A Spanish version of the survey was available in the online and paper format.

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

Survey response rates have continued to increase since the survey was moved to an online format in 2016. There was an increase of 9,545 responses in this collection from the prior year. The change in format was designed to increase participation and decrease possible nonresponse bias. Nonresponse bias analysis examined response and nonresponse on the survey at the unit level (i.e., participation v. nonparticipation), not the item level. The number of respondents in a specific ethnic/racial group (self-reported) in the survey were compared to the number of students reported in the ethnic/racial group in the Child Count for FY21 with relative percentages calculated. For example, there were 123 parent respondents who identified as American Indian and 440 students who were reported as American Indian on the Child Count resulting in a participation/response rate of 27.95% with nonparticipation/nonresponse rate at 72.05%. There was a 16.69% nonresponse difference between the highest participating group and lowest participating group. Survey response rates and inversely nonresponse rates were reported respectively as: White (20.08%, 79.92%), African American (12.03%, 87.79%), Hispanic (11.26%, 88.74%), Asian (16.40%, 83.60%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (19.67%, 80.33%), American Indian (27.95%, 72.05%), and More than One Race (16.08%, 83.02%). The nonresponse rate was indicative of some areas requiring targeted focus to encourage participation, but not a pervasive and pronounced nonresponse bias. The Hispanic group had the highest rate of nonresponse. The survey is available in Spanish and parent mentors at the LEA level are reaching out to individual parents to increase participation in this subgroup.

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

Georgia examined the representativeness of the parents responding to the Parent Survey based upon the percentages of students served by race/ethnicity. In examining variance, Georgia used a band of + or - 5% in parental response rate based upon racial/ethnic representation of students

receiving special education services. For example, if 80% of the students with disabilities are in the White subgroup, a representative rate of response would be 75 to 85% of survey respondents.

These data reveal that a higher percentage of the parents of White SWD responded to the survey (50.36%) compared to the percentage of White SWD enrolled (38.4%). A lower percentage of the parents of Black SWD responded to the survey (30.96%) as compared to Black SWD enrolled (39.3%). All other race/ethnicity survey participation and enrollments were within the + or - 5%. The response and enrollment rates were respectively reported as: Hispanic 11.66% and 15.8%, Asian 2.29% and 2.1%, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0.11% and 0.1%, American Indian 0.36% and 0.20%, and More than One Race 4.25% and 4.00%.

Georgia also completed an analysis of respondents based upon the percentages of parent reported area of student disability and students served by disability area with a response rate band of + or -5%. Response rates were largely consistent between parent reported area of disability and the area of students served by disability in the FY2021 Child Count. The percentage of responses were slightly higher from parents of children with Autism (7.47% higher than demographic group); the percentage of responses were lower from parents of children with Other Health Impairment (5.87% less than the demographic group) and Specific Learning Disability (9.69% less than the demographic group); responses were commensurate for all other areas of disability (less than 2% difference). Two thousand two hundred and nineteen (6.52%) respondents did not designate the disability category of their child. The survey is anonymously completed by parents and the disability category may not be correctly designated or may reflect secondary or tertiary disabilities rather than the primary disability. In addition, as reflected by the increase in parents who did not identify a disability, parents may not always be aware of the specific disability designation.

Georgia's percentage of parents reporting their schools facilitated parental involvement in FFY20 rose to 90.21% from 88.5% in the FFY19 collection. The number of valid responses increased from 24,492 in FFY2019 to 34,037 in FFY2020. The methodology used by Georgia for the measuring Indicator 8 is an online survey available to all parents of SWD in Georgia.

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

NO

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

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

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

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

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

COVID did not impact the validity, reliability, and completeness of Indicator 8 data.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 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.

**8 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**8 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.48%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

12

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	211	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

The risk ratio is calculated using a compound equation and the minimum cell and n sizes above are required. The numerator of the equation requires:

(A) If  $\geq 10$  children in the LEA in a specific racial/ethnic group, such as Hispanic, in the LEA are identified as SWD, and

(B) 30 students enrolled in the LEA are in the same racial/ethnic group as (A). If both conditions are satisfied, the group will be evaluated for risk.

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

If the LEA has (C)  $\geq 10$  children in the LEA in all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) identified as students with disabilities, and

(D) 30 or more children enrolled in the LEA in all other racial ethnic groups (not Hispanic), the LEA comparison group will be used in the calculation of the Risk Ratio.

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

(C) the number of all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) of students identified as students with disabilities in the state, and

(D) all other children in all other racial/ethnic groups (not Hispanic) in the state. The use of the state comparison group is termed the Alternate Risk Ratio.

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

Methodology: Only LEAs with at least 10 students with disabilities identified as students with disabilities in the same ethnic/racial group and 30 students enrolled in the same racial/ethnic category with a risk ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years are included in the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation for the State. For example, an LEA would be included if there were 15 students with disabilities in the Hispanic ethnicity subgroup, an enrollment of 500 children total in the Hispanic ethnicity subgroup, and a Risk Ratio of 4.5 for two consecutive years. There were no LEAs that had a risk ratio of  $\geq 3.0$ .

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

Since FFY2015, Georgia has not had any LEA with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups receiving special education and related services. Therefore, Georgia has not needed to determine whether any LEA had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification since FFY2015. Georgia determines disproportionate representation by first examining the data. If an LEA had a Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years for identification as a student with disabilities receiving special education and related services in any racial/ethnic group, that LEA would be considered to have disproportionate representation. The State would utilize the established Comprehensive Compliance Review to examine 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, reevaluation, and eligibility determination processes. LEAs whose data demonstrate that they have disproportionate representation must review their policies, procedures, and practices. The State would then determine if inappropriate policies, procedures, and/or practices contributed to the disproportionate representation (noncompliance). If determined to have noncompliance, the LEA would be 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)

COVID did not impact the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 9. Due to a change in the Measurement Table for FFY 2020-2025, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Georgia is requesting to reset the baseline at 0% using FFY 2020 data.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2016, however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2019 or FFY 2020 data.

**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 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	1.46%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	11.27%	8.29%	2.90%	5.61%	3.54%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 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.**

18

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
37	3	205	3.54%	0%	1.46%	N/A	N/A

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

YES

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

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

Only LEAs that meet the minimum cell and n sizes above are evaluated at the LEA level for disproportionality by the State for inclusion in the Georgia number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size. There were 205 LEAs meeting the criteria.

The Risk Ratio is calculated using a compound equation and the minimum cell and n sizes above are required. The numerator of the equation requires:

(A)  $\geq 10$  children in the LEA in a specific racial/ethnic group (i.e., White) in one of the specified categories of special education (i.e., Other Health Impaired), and

(B) 30 or more students enrolled in the LEA are the same racial/ethnic group as (A). If both conditions are satisfied, the group will be evaluated for risk.

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

If the LEA has:

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

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

(C) the number of all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) of students identified in the specified category of special education (Other Health Impaired) in the State, and

(D) all other children in all other racial/ethnic groups (not White) enrolled in the State. The use of the State comparison group is termed the Alternate Risk Ratio.

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

**Methodology:** Only LEAs with at least 10 students with disabilities identified in the same ethnic/racial group in the specific category of special education and 30 students enrolled in a specific racial/ethnic category and at the LEA level with a risk ratio  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years are included in the number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of LEAs for the State that have disproportionate representation. For example, an LEA would be included if there were 15 students in the special education category of Other Health Impaired in the White racial subgroup, an enrollment of 500 children total in the White racial subgroup, and a Risk Ratio of 4.5 for two consecutive years. There were 37 LEAs that met the threshold level with a risk ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  for 2 consecutive years.

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

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

As a first step, LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation in specific disability categories reviewed their policies, practices, and

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

In the next part of the Self-Rating, LEAs completed a Student Referral Chart. The chart required the number of students referred in the prior school year, number of students found eligible, and the number of students found ineligible. Next, LEAs were required to upload a representative number of student files (based upon LEA size group) found eligible in the LEA for the specific area of disproportionate representation identified (i.e., Specific Learning Disability). The listing also had to include a specified number of students who were determined ineligible for special education. The minimum number of files reviewed was 10. For all files uploaded, the LEA provided the following information: student name, gender, grade level, school, race/ethnicity, name of interventions, duration of intervention, frequency of monitoring, reason for referral, found eligible y or n, and eligibility category.

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

The final portion of the Self-Rating was a Compliance Review Discussion Questions section for the team to complete. LEA responded to items such as:

- a) What is the composition of the LEA by race, gender? What is the composition of the LEA’s students with disabilities by race, gender?
- b) Discuss the eligibility determination process that is being implemented in your LEA. How is your LEA implementing the process with fidelity and integrity for all eligibility categories and specifically in the area of disproportionality findings in your LEA.

Results Driven Accountability GaDOE staff reviewed all LEA submitted documentation using a standardized protocol. The GaDOE staff communicated with LEAs during the review process for clarification and to answer any unresolved questions from the documentation. Based upon the review, GaDOE determined if inappropriate policies, practices, or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation resulting in noncompliance. Using this Comprehensive Compliance Review process, 3 of the 37 LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies, procedures, and practices.

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

COVID did not impact the reliability, validity, or completeness of the Indicator 10 data. Due to a change in the Measurement Table for FFY 2020-2025, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Georgia is requesting to reset its Indicator 10 baseline using FFY 2020 data to 1.46%.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the seven districts identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 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 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State reported its baseline for this indicator using data from FFY 2016, however, OSEP cannot accept this baseline because of revisions to the Measurement Table. Specifically, with the FFY 2020 APR submission, all States are now required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Therefore, the State must revise its baseline using FFY 2019 or FFY2020 data.

**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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.80%	98.56%	97.91%	98.54%	98.80%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
27,877	27,364	98.80%	100%	98.16%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

513

**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 513 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: 141

Evaluation completed 11-30 days after 60 days: 107

Evaluation completed 31-60 days after 60 days: 78

Evaluation completed > 60 days after 60 days: 187

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

Student delay (excessive absences, withdrawal, re-enrollment): 30 (5.8%)

Parent delay (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner): 63 (12.3%)

Teacher/evaluator delay (teachers not following through, lack of psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech language pathologists): 287 (55.95%)

District errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policy, and procedures): 22 (4.3%)

Other reasons such as school closure due to weather: 111 (21.6%)

Total Late: 513 (100%)

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

LEAs maintained a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. A date based, auto-calculation spreadsheet was provided for LEAs that opted not to use the state provided IEP platform (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY21%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/Initial%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx>). The spreadsheet tracked the number of parental consents for evaluation and the number of evaluations completed on time. If evaluations were completed late (based on 60-day timeline), the number of days late and the reasons and exceptions for lateness were also collected in the spreadsheet. For LEAs that opted to use the State-Provided IEP platform, this information was generated within IEP Platform. Special Education Directors submitted the data by September 30th for the previous fiscal year. The data were submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application used to track this indicator year-to-year. A follow-up submission was collected on November 30, 2021 for LEAs with evaluations that were not completed by September 30, 2021 for parental consents for evaluation received between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021. The GaDOE reviewed the Child Find data of each LEA to ensure timely initial evaluations. Georgia has a 60-day requirement from receipt of consent to the completion of the evaluation. This is a compliance indicator with a target of 100% completed on time.

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 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. Also, Special Education Directors were required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation was completed. This addressed the isolated findings of non-compliance. Prong 2 required Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance.

The GaDOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. The verification process ensures timeline data submitted are accurate. LEAs randomly selected are required to submit through the SE Applications Dashboard supporting documentation for the aggregate data that is provided to the State. LEAs are required to submit the following information for students evaluated for special education eligibility in the July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021 data collection window: name, date of receipt of parental consent for evaluation, and completion of evaluation. After the submission, the State requires the LEA to submit documents (i.e., parental consents, evaluations) on students selected from the LEA provided list to substantiate the reported information.

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

COVID did not impact the validity, reliability, or completeness of data for Indicator 11.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
328	328	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

For the LEAs identified as having noncompliance, the State required them to submit a narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications 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 Nov. 10, 2020 to January 22, 2021 were required to be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application. GaDOE staff reviewed the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has corrected policies, practices, and procedures to ensure timely evaluation. Based on the review of information uploaded in the Timeline application of the state Dashboard by LEAs with noncompliance, GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 made necessary changes and that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements. Additionally, each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the Special Education Applications Dashboard.

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

For FFY2019, LEAs not at 100% compliant had to complete Prong 1 activities. Prong 1 required Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Along with the narrative, the Special Education Directors submitted the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. The deadline for this collection was November 12, 2020. 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.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**11 - OSEP Response**

**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

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	85.50%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.75%	99.52%	98.98%	98.40%	98.40%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,149
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	531

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,228
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.	1,296
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	23
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	2,228	2,299	98.40%	100%	96.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The overall number of children referred from Part C to Part B have increased due to targeted guidance provided by Georgia DSESS to LEAs. The guidance addressed the children to include as referred to Part B from Part C. In Georgia, the Department of Human Resources through the agency Babies Can't Wait (BCW) administers Part C and makes referral to Part B. BCW refers children, with parent agreement, to Part B at the LEA level based upon the addresses of the children. All children referred from BCW to the LEA are to be included in the total group of students referred from Part C to Part B (line a). DSESS clarified that the total of children referred from Part C to Part B is not dependent upon the total number of parental consents for evaluation (for Part B eligibility) secured. An analysis of the slippage from FFY2019 to FFY 2020 indicated that there were 603 additional referrals from Part c to Part B (line a in the table above). The increase in the number of referrals captured yielded a decrease of 1.49% percentage points in the percent of children transitioned by the age of 3 from Part C to Part B. LEAs were faced many challenges in the completion of evaluations of young children and transition with large scale staffing shortages due to COVID (see [https://www.times-georgian.com/teacher-pipeline-plan-gets-kemp-ok-in-year-of-classroom-covid-anxiety/article\\_ffeaa5de-5cf3-5181-bef5-d7d06ea29646.html](https://www.times-georgian.com/teacher-pipeline-plan-gets-kemp-ok-in-year-of-classroom-covid-anxiety/article_ffeaa5de-5cf3-5181-bef5-d7d06ea29646.html)).

**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**

71

**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 FFY2020, Georgia reported 71 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: 10 students
- 11 - 30 days: 15 students
- 31 - 60 days: 15 students
- > 60 days: 31 students

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

- Student delay: 1 student (1.4%)
- Parent delay: 16 students (22.5%)
- Teacher/evaluator delay: 19 students (26.8%)
- System errors: 6 students (8.5%)
- Other (school closure due to weather): 26 students (36.6%)
- Student referred to LEA by BCW less than 90 days before 3rd birthday: 3 students (4.2%)
- Total Late: 71 (100%)

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

LEAs maintained a log of children transitioning from Part C to Part B and dates that an eligibility determination was made and IEP in place. A spreadsheet was provided for LEAs not participating in the state provided IEP platform (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Conference/FY22%20Pres%20Rec%20Doc/BCW%20Timelines%20Tracking%20Log.xlsx> ) which tracked the number of referrals, the number of children who have an IEP developed and in place by the 3 birthday, if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. For LEAs participating in the state provided IEP platform, the data was generated within the platform. Special Education Directors submitted the data on September 30, 2021 (for the July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021 window) with a follow-up for any outstanding transitions on November 30, 2021. The aggregated transition data were submitted in the GaDOE portal Timelines Application located within the secured Special Education Applications Portal used to track this indicator year-to-year.

Special Education Directors were 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 was submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Applications Portal. Also, Special Education Directors were required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date the evaluation/eligibility and IEP were completed,

and the student transitioned. This Prong 1 data was due January 31, 2022. GaDOE staff review the data to verify compliance. This addresses individual cases of non-compliance.

Additionally, Prong 2 required 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, 2021 through December 31, 2021 will be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application February 14, 2022 through March 14, 2022. GaDOE staff review the data submitted to determine whether the LEA had policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely evaluation.

The GaDOE also conducted 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 an LEA reported 150 evaluations/eligibilities/IEPs for young children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed, the director uploads a spreadsheet with the names, consent date, completion dates, and accompanying demographic data showing evidence that those 150 referrals were completed in a timely manner. GaDOE staff may then check these data against what the school system reported in the Student Record data collection.

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

COVID impacted staffing availability which adversely impacted the timeliness of transitions of young children

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
46	46	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Georgia required that each LEA submit Early Childhood Transition timeline data by September 30, 2020. LEA reported data revealed some young children were referred to special education from Part C and found eligible but did not have an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday. These LEAs are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 2, as well as Prong 1 monitoring, to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements.

Special Education Directors for the LEAs identified as having noncompliance were required to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. The LEAs must submit additional data to verify that 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 Special Education Applications 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 2019 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**

Georgia required that each LEA submit Early Childhood Transition timeline data by September 30, 2020. LEA reported data revealed some young children were referred to special education from Part C and found eligible but did not have an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday. These LEAs are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 2, as well as Prong 1 monitoring, to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements.

Special Education Directors for the LEAs identified as having noncompliance were required to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. The LEAs must submit additional data to verify that 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 Special Education Applications 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 2019 made any necessary changes and are now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	94.25%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.40%	99.09%	94.25%	91.36%	91.10%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
275	300	91.10%	100%	91.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

For FFY 20 GaDOE reviewed the transition plans of students aged 16 and over (grades 9-12) at the time of the review. The GaDOE DSESS reviewed 5 transition plans for 60 randomly selected LEAs for a total of 300 plans. LEAs were required to submit the transition plan and IEP meeting notices in the Secondary Transition Application of the Special Education Applications Dashboard by February 12, 2021. Prior to the submission of the plans, LEAs selected were provided with specific guidance about the nature and scope of the transition plan review (see Transition Planning <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Transition/2020-21/FY21%20Indicator%2013%20Updated%20Transition%20Presentation.pdf> Writing Compliant Transition Plans (gadoe.org). LEAs were encouraged to complete a self-assessment of transition plans prior to submission using the Transition Documentation Checklist (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Transition/Transition%20Documentation%20Checklist%20%20July%202019.pdf>) and other resources available at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Transition-Compliance.aspx>. LEAs

The transition plans were reviewed between February 15, 2021 and February 26, 2021 by GaDOE DSESS in the Results Driven Accountability Unit for compliance with the following transition plan indicators: postsecondary outcome goal for employment, postsecondary outcome goal for education/training, postsecondary outcome goal for independent living (if appropriate), annual transition goals that reflect steps to desired post-secondary outcome goals, postsecondary goals based upon transition assessments, transition services and/or activities to facilitate movement to postsecondary outcomes, course of study to facilitate movement to post-school outcomes, student invited to the meeting, agency representative invited (if applicable) and parental consent received prior to inviting agency representative (if applicable). For transition plans to be determined 100% compliant, each indicator in the reviewed criteria had to be met. If there were questions about any transition indicator containing the necessary elements, a second reviewer at GaDOE validated or refuted the decision. All DSESS reviewers participated in a training session for reviewing transition components prior to evaluating any transition plans. The training provided clear descriptions and examples of acceptable plan components to ensure consistency of the evaluation of plans.

An LEA was determined compliant only if all transition plan indicators on all reviewed plans were compliant. For LEAs that had transition plans found to be non-compliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities were required. LEAs were notified of their compliance status on February 26, 2021, and Prong 1 and Prong 2 data were subsequently submitted in the Special Education Applications Dashboard. Prong 1 (due March 31, 2021) required the correction of non-compliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices, and procedures regarding transition planning. Prong 2 (due by April 30, 2021) required the submission of additional transition plans for review. LEAs with non-compliance were required to submit additional plans to address systemic compliance. LEAs with continued non-compliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required components for secondary transition. LEAs were also provided with targeted TA on writing compliant Transition Plans.

The GaDOE calculated the percentage of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above containing each of the required components for secondary transition by dividing the number of compliant plans submitted by the total number of plans in the original submission. The GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data collected through the Special Education Applications Portal.

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

**If no, please explain**

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

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

COVID did not impact the reliability, validity, or completeness of Indicator 13. All school systems had multiple opportunities for professional learning regarding Transition Planning for students with disabilities. An online seminar 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 offered training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference and the Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
29	29	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

For school systems that had transition plans found to be noncompliant, Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities were required. Prong 2 addressed the implementation of regulatory requirements. Prong 2 required the submission of additional transition plans for review. School systems with non-compliance were required to submit additional plans equal to the number they submitted initially, based on their size. School systems with continued non-compliance were required to continue to submit plans until the GaDOE determined that the transition plans had the required regulatory components for secondary transition. School systems had to demonstrate 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements. GaDOE verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 made any necessary changes and were now correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements

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

Prong 1 required the correction of individual noncompliant transition plan(s) and review and revision, if necessary, of policies, practices, and procedures regarding transition planning. Each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY2019 achieved 100% compliance based on a review of updated data (i.e.,

a revised transition plan) subsequently collected through the State secured data system (Special Education Applications). The state verified that for each student determined to have noncompliant transition plan(s), a new transition plan was developed, reviewed, and determined to be compliant within one year of notification of noncompliance. Numerous technical assistance and professional development opportunities were provided to the noncompliant systems on revising individual noncompliant plans such as a Professional Learning Guide to Writing IEPs Training Series which includes a module on writing compliant transition plans. The GaDOE also offered training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE) conference and the Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023,** when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target >=	25.50%	26.25%	27.00%	27.40%	27.40%
A	27.23%	Data	26.00%	25.80%	25.95%	24.44%	25.62%
B	2009	Target >=	53.70%	53.70%	53.90%	54.00%	54.00%
B	51.46%	Data	56.07%	58.75%	59.76%	58.40%	57.78%
C	2009	Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.10%	80.10%	80.10%
C	77.08%	Data	78.46%	82.88%	82.92%	84.77%	83.98%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	27.40%	27.40%	27.80%	27.80%	27.80%	27.90%
Target B >=	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target C >=	81.00%	82.00%	82.00%	83.00%	83.00%	84.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

## FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	13,257
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	10,986
Response Rate	82.87%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2,951
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	3,678
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)	878
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).	1,747

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2,951	10,986	25.62%	27.40%	26.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6,629	10,986	57.78%	55.00%	60.34%	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)	9,254	10,986	83.98%	81.00%	84.23%	Met target	No Slippage

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	81.82%	82.87%

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

The effective strategies provided by GaDOE to LEAs include the following:

- 1) encouraging LEAs to have IEP case managers and/or transition specialists of exiting students collect extensive contact information to use the next year to enable contact and a follow-up on student outcomes and progress
- 2) encouraging LEAs to reach out to students using social media, such as Facebook
- 3) posting the exiters from the prior school year in February of the current school year for each LEA in Special Education Applications to enable LEAs to start reaching out to students in a timely manner
- 4) encouraging LEAs to review the listing of exiters by the student’s Georgia’s unique Testing Identifier (GTID) in the Georgia GUIDE system to be

- certain exiting students have not reenrolled in either their LEA or another LEA prior to census submission
- 5) encouraging LEAs to use bilingual resources and interpreters to contact students who are English Learners
- 6) LEAs work with vocational rehabilitation counselors who assist in locating exiters

GaDOE provides extensive support to LEAs directed at encouraging response rate increase through presentations (see example PowerPoint Presentation [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/SELDA/2021-2022/July%2021/Applications\\_Dashboard\\_July\\_8\\_2021.pdf](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/SELDA/2021-2022/July%2021/Applications_Dashboard_July_8_2021.pdf) on (gadoe.org), email reminders via Email Blasts, and a guidance document (see Post-School Survey for 2019-2021 Exiters FY2021 Data Collection at <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Documents/Data%20Info/FY21/FY21%20Post-School%20Outcomes%20for%202019-2020%20Exiters.pdf>).

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5% to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2019-2020 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for response.

Response analysis and nonresponse bias analysis examined response and nonresponse on the survey at the unit level (i.e., participation v. nonparticipation), not the item level. For response rate, the percentage of total survey respondents in a specific ethnic/racial group in the survey was compared to the total percentage of students who exited at the conclusion of the prior school year in the same ethnic/racial group. For example, there were 4,752 African American of the 10,986 total respondents, which comprised 43.26% of total respondents. There were 5,734 African American total exiters of the total 13,257 exiters which comprised 43.25% of total exiters. The relative response rates and relative exiter rates were >1% for all ethnic and racial groups. Specific response rates are provided for all racial and ethnic groups in the next section.

Nonresponse analysis was conducted by calculating the percentage of total survey nonrespondents in a specific ethnic/racial group in the survey compared to the total percentage of students who exited at the conclusion of the prior school year in the same ethnic/racial group. There were 982 African American of the 2,271 total nonrespondents, which comprised 43.24% of total nonrespondents. There were 5,734 African American total exiters of the total 13,257 exiters which comprised 43.25% of total exiters. The relative response rates and relative exiter rates were > 4% for all ethnic and racial groups. Specific nonresponse rates are provided for all racial and ethnic groups in the next section. The nonresponse rate was not indicative of a nonresponse bias. The Hispanic subgroup showed a 3.5% overrepresentation in nonrespondents. The DSESS at GaDOE is currently adding a Program Specialist to support the needs of English Learner families and students. One objective of this position is enhanced communication with students and their families when language is a barrier. Based upon the results of Indicators 8 and 14 nonresponse data (i.e., overrepresentation of the Hispanic ethnicity), enhancing communication will be a key strategy to increasing the feedback of parents and students.

**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.**

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5% to examine proportionate participation and nonparticipation in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2019-2020 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for response.

Response rates are reported based upon a total of 10,986 respondents for the survey in FFY2020 based upon 13,257 total students who exited school the prior school year. Ethnic/racial groups are reported as follows: African-American 4,752 respondents (43.26%) and 5,734 exiters (43.25%), Hispanic 1,413 respondents (12.86%) and 1,785 exiters (13.46%), Hispanic 1,413 respondents (12.86%) and 1,785 exiters (13.46%), American Indian/Native American 19 respondents (0.17%) and 25 exiters (0.19%), More than One Race 356 respondents (3.24%) and 428 exiters (3.23%), Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian 9 respondents (0.08%) and 12 exiters (0.09%), Asian 155 respondents (1.41%) and 185 exiters (1.40%), and White 4,282 respondents (38.98%) and 5,088 exiters (38.38%).

Nonresponse rates are reported based upon a total of 2,271 nonrespondents for the survey in FFY2020 from the total of 13,257 total students who exited school the prior school year. Ethnic/racial groups are reported as follows: African-American 982 nonrespondents (43.24%) and 5,734 exiters (43.25%), Hispanic 372 nonrespondents (16.38%) and 1,785 exiters (13.46%), American Indian/Native American 6 nonrespondents (0.26%) and 25 exiters (0.19%), More than One Race 72 nonrespondents (3.17%) and 428 exiters (3.23%), Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian 3 nonrespondents (0.13%) and 12 exiters (0.09%), Asian 30 nonrespondents (1.32%) and 185 exiters (1.40%), and White 806 nonrespondents (35.49%) and 5,088 exiters (38.38%).

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

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

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

Georgia used a range of +5 or -5% to examine proportionate participation (response) and nonparticipation (nonresponse) in the survey for this reporting period based upon the racial/ethnic representation of the students who exited at the conclusion of the 2019-2020 school year. There were no participation rates that fell outside of this range in any racial/ethnic group for response.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

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

COVID did not impact the validity, reliability, or completeness of Indicator 14.

#### **14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **14 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for 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 and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	23
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	60.98%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	62.80%	62.90%	63.00%	63.10%	63.10%
Data	64.55%	57.83%	45.83%	60.98%	43.24%

#### Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	23	43.24%	50.00%	70.00%	13.04%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The number of resolutions sessions decreased from 37 in the prior year to 23 in the current reporting period. The 38% decrease in the total number of resolution sessions had an adverse impact on the total percentage of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements. The reduction in the overall number contributed to the volatility of the calculation. Resolution session outcomes are variable from year to year based upon the specific circumstances involved.

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

Georgia is requesting that this Indicator now be addressed through a target range of 50-70% due to its variability. In addition, the target range will align it with Indicator 16 and present the information more cohesively across both Indicators. Navigation of services for students with disabilities during the COVID pandemic have yielded an increase in novel situations that have not been resolved with the same degree of success through resolution sessions. The novel situations and fluctuations in the number of Resolution Sessions have yielded highly unstable data. The representation of the target through a target range will allow for a more realistic evaluation of progress while acknowledging the high degree of variability in this Indicator.

Georgia is requesting that the baseline for this Indicator be reset to the 2018 data level of 60.98% which would fall within the target range of 50% to 70% requested. The prior baseline reported in 2005 is 88.00%, which is 15 years old, and none of the targets reported for Georgia since 2006 are at or above this level. In 2007, the target was set at 60% and it has never exceeded 63.10%, which is 24.9% percentage points below the baseline. Georgia has shown an increase in litigation in the the last few years. In fact, GaDOE is currently hiring additional personnel in the Family Engagement and Dispute Resolution unit to provide more proactive support to LEAs. Georgia is also hiring an Ombudsman to provide additional support to the LEAs and families with neutrality. The Ombudsman will serve as a designated neutral party who advocates for a fair process and provides confidential, informal assistance and support to parents, guardians, advocates, educators, and students with disabilities.

Georgia recognizes the need to encourage LEAs and parents to work through the resolution process and endeavors to enhance communication through several avenues including IEP Team Meeting Facilitation (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/IEP-Facilitation.aspx> ). Located on the website are several resources such as a Parent Guide, IEP Facilitation Form, Facilitated IEP (FIEP) Promotional Flyer, and IEP Facilitation Policies Manual. There is also a helpful video to outline the process. Georgia also provides a Special Education Help Desk number (404) 656-3963 and email address SPEDHelpDesk@doe.k12.ga.us for parents with questions and concerns. Parent Engagement Specialists provide support at both contacts and support parents in working with LEAs to intervene in situations before they reach the level of needing a Resolution Session.

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	92
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	31

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	62.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	50.00% - 70.00%	50.00% - 70.00%	50.00%-70.00%
Data	48.53%	54.44%	63.11%	61.54%	65.88%

#### Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%	50.00%	70.00%

#### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
7	31	92	65.88%	50.00%	70.00%	41.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The number of mediations held increased by 7 in FFY 2020, unfortunately the number of mediation agreements decreased by 18. The volatility of the data has led to the decrease in the percentage of successful mediations. Mediation outcomes are variable from year to year based upon the specific circumstances involved. Percentages for successful mediations have varied by up to 24.58 percentage points across the 2015 through 2020 reporting period.

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

Navigation of services for students with disabilities during the COVID pandemic have yielded an increase in novel situations that have not been resolved with the same degree of success through mediations. Georgia recognizes the need to encourage LEAs and parents to work through the mediation process and endeavors to enhance communication through several avenues including IEP Team Meeting Facilitation (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/IEP-Facilitation> ). Located on the website are several resources such as a Parent Guide, IEP Facilitation Form, Facilitated IEP (FIEP) Promotional Flyer, and IEP Facilitation Policies Manual. There is also a helpful video to outline the process. Georgia also provides a Special Education Help Desk number (404) 656-3963 and email address SPEDHelpDesk@doe.k12.ga.us for parents with questions and concerns. Parent Engagement Specialists provide support at both contacts and support parents in working with LEAs to intervene in situations before they reach the level of needing a Mediation.

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

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

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

##### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

##### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

### C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

#### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The SiMR for FFY20 is to increase graduation rates for students with disabilities in 50 selected districts to 67% Annual Event Graduation Rate.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The State uses the annual event graduation rate to measure its target. The subgroup for intensive support includes the 10 selected Targeted Support Improvement (TSI) Districts/Schools/SSIP Districts (APS, Bibb, Clarke, Clayton, DeKalb, Meriwether, Newton, Richmond, Seminole, Treutlen). This group was selected because of the collective support from School Improvement and Special Education. These districts were identified as TSI due to low graduation rates for students with disabilities and/or closing the gap and content mastery.

The State SSIP provides universal support for all districts through its PL (Professional Learning) series, Leadership Launches, and monthly collaborative communities.

#### Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

#### Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

#### Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

#### If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The State Advisory Panel, Collaborative Community Stakeholders and other SSIP stakeholders voiced through surveys, virtual discussions and monthly SSIP meetings that more professional learning is needed to address instructional strategies, retention of special education teachers and supports to school based administrators. On the SSIP District Annual Survey, stakeholders asked for more training for specially designed instruction, HLPs, support to new teachers and administrators. Because of this data the State is expanding the Coherent Strategy One: Professional Learning activities.

The SSIP PL Series which was extremely popular this year will continue. A Special Education and School Based Administrator Academy (SESBA) will begin in January 2022 with 142 school-based administrators with an executive coach to support the SSIP work in the schools, with the two-program specialist. This will provide focused professional learning and coaching to school based administrators expanding the SSIP work to the school level, rather than just the district level. To address the request from stakeholders to provide more support in the area of specially designed instruction, the State is contracting with Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey and Doug Fukes from America's Institute of Research to provide ongoing training and coaching around Specially Designed Instruction (SDI). A SDI webpage was built and is updated frequently with asynchronous and synchronous modules, tools, and resources. A Multi-Sensory Reading Grant to train teachers in multi sensory reading approaches such as Orton-Gillingham, Wilson Reading and to receive training in Dyslexia has been offered to build capacity for special education teachers in the area of literacy. The Teacher Provider Retention Project to provide professional development training to new special education teachers on HLPs in partnership with CEEDAR, Great Teacher Leaders and several higher ed institutions has also been implemented to support Coherent Strategies 1 Professional learning and address outcomes for mid-term goals around student achievement and graduation rates. Each of these additional professional learning projects are to support the short and mid-term goals related to student achievement and building capacity.

The State has updated targets for short-term, mid-term and long-term goals due to challenges related to the pandemic. These additional professional learning events are supported by challenges remain as turnover of district and school leadership and teachers remains dramatically high. It is necessary to continue to train and retrain new district leaders and teachers. Stakeholder input, survey results and data trend analytics reviews indicated we are making slight progress with our current activities but must continue to build capacity and address challenges around retention. Stakeholder feedback continues to ask for specific digital tools and resources to guide the work of Student Success. The SSIP collaborates with Georgia's Teacher Provider Retention Program to help selected districts recruit and retain special education teachers. The program provides ongoing PL around HLPs (High Leverage Practices). The ten selected districts are making progress but face many challenges related to COVID and other challenges. The continued consistency of SSIP activities is key to building sustainability.

The State SSIP team and School District Effectiveness provide ongoing collective support, yet the District Implementation Fidelity Rubrics are different. After completing a crosswalk of the two documents, gaining stakeholder feedback and discussion with the state implementation team, the State would like to change the District Implementation Fidelity Rubric to using the School District Effectiveness rubric which is aligned to Georgia's Continuous Improvement System and Implementation Science indicators.

The revised rubric will be implemented for FFY21.

The State's current theory of action is located at <https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/ap/p-59584e83/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshealy.sharepoint.com%2F%3A%2F%2FSSIPTeam%2FEZmoif6UHjtFsXOLufwI8EYB9gzEzseYWNwt0GhiryHAatg%3Fe%3Dtc1c91&data=04%7C01%7Cdkemp%40doe.k12.ga.us%7C6bd38ac9dba4e69881708d9e26e6a9d%7C1aa55c8303434ecbbd39bd7f43>

**Progress toward the SiMR**

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2017	63.20%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>= =	67.00%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%	68.50%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Students with IEPs (age 14-21) who exit high school with a regular diploma	Students with IEPs (age 14-21) who exit high school by graduating with a regular diploma, dropping out, or receiving a certificate.	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,119	5,911	73.37%	67.00%	69.68%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

618 exiting data of the IDEA EDfacts file FS009 is used to calculate the annual event graduation rate. SY2020-21 assessment data groups EDfacts file specs FS175 and FS178 for ELA and Math.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

The data were collected from 618B SPP/APR data (FS009) and FS175 and FS178 for ELA and Math. It was analyzed during the current reporting period; the State used the Georgia Systems of Continuous Improvement framework to create a common problem-solving process that could be used across all districts and schools to identify improvement strategies and practices implemented to improve student outcomes. Georgia's Systems of Continuous Improvement includes five steps: identify needs, select interventions, plan implementation, implement plan, examine progress. These strategies and practices identified through the problem-solving process were documented in the District Improvement Plans or District Plans of Support. Schools also used the framework to identify improvement strategies and practices that were included in School Improvement Plans. Implementation of the problem-solving process (initially the Student Success Process and now the Georgia Systems of Continuous Improvement) with fidelity at the district and school levels is critical to achieving the desired effects because the implementation of the process itself leads to the selection and implementation of specific evidence-based practices based on district/school needs and capacity to implement. Intensive professional learning and follow-up technical assistance was provided by the GaDOE to support districts and schools in utilizing this framework. The State provides as part of SSIP a School Completion Toolkit that guides districts through a deep analysis of data and provides evidence-based tools and resources to support data analysis and interventions. Other success measures are used to support the data such as the Georgia Milestones district and school level data, stakeholder engagement, district annual surveys, fidelity rubrics, LEA benchmarks, and coaching logs.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

The State collects the following measures of success: District Team Implementation Fidelity Rubric with evidence, Evidence-based Practice Fidelity Rubric, Benchmark data on EBPs, District Annual Survey, State/Regional Technical Support Annual Survey, professional learning evaluation survey, District Plan of Support Short Term Action Plan progress data, state assessment data on academic proficiency, annual event graduation rates, district benchmark data and anecdotal data from continuous improvement team meetings.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

In prior reporting years, Georgia included students with disabilities who graduated with an alternate diploma in determining the annual event graduation rate, because of a waiver with ESSA. Based on a change in the waiver status and guidance from OSEP, the calculation was revised, and it no longer includes the alternate diploma as a general education diploma. This change will cause FFY20 to be baseline data. The State has provided technical assistance and communication to districts concerning the change.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

The data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, in data completeness and the ability to collect data for this indicator's reporting. Covid-19 impacted data completeness for three of the key measures in the SSIP evaluation plan: Percentage of students with disabilities in districts selected to receive intensive supports scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System, percentage of students with disabilities in target schools scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System and percentage of selected districts decreasing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and the All-students group. The data source for each of the above measures was the Georgia Milestones Assessment System using data from EDFacts FS175 and FS178 spring 2021 administration. Georgia received a waiver from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education related to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which waived accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Documents/ESSA/ga%20acct%20waiver%20response.pdf>). However, high stakes testing was not waived and resumed for all students, including students with disabilities, in the 2020-2021 school year. Students participating in virtual instruction were not required to report to a physical school facility for assessment participation if there were health concerns. As a result, the number of students participating in assessments was significantly lower than previous years for all students, including students with disabilities. The participation rates and results reported for student assessment are not viewed to be an accurate representation of the achievement of students with disabilities. Of all the Indicators in the SPP/APR, Assessment is by far the most adversely impacted by COVID-19. Georgia has historically had remarkable success in maintaining 95% participation in high stakes testing. The decreased participation rates for 2020-2021 are a direct result of COVID-19. The results of the assessment are also likely a significant underrepresentation of the capabilities of Georgia's students with disabilities based upon the smaller group of students with disabilities assessed. Finally, Georgia's results on the assessments are not dramatically different from those obtained for students without disabilities and reflect the overall impact of COVID. As Georgia has a large population with several densely populated urban areas, such an impact is not surprising.

The State did work with districts to provide benchmark data on all EBPs that were implemented for the SSIP. Data for all other key measures and the State's SiMR were available and are reported in this APR (ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT). The State did not identify any concerns regarding data validity and reliability for the current reporting period. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection, the State SSIP Program Manager, SSIP Program Specialist and the collaborating partners of the Division for School and District Effectiveness worked with the 10 selected intensive SSIP/Targeted Support Improvement (TSI) districts to collect and analyze all available data related to the FFY20 SSIP activities and outcomes. The districts were selected based upon TSI status for not meeting the ESSA graduation and content mastery/closing the gap achievement targets for students with disabilities. Benchmark data were collected on all evidence-based interventions and implementation fidelity was measured using the GaDOE EBP Implementation Fidelity Rubric. Additional data are reported in subsequent sections of this report.

## Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

[https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/ap/w-59584e83?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshealy.sharepoint.com%2F%3Aw%3A%2Fs%2FSSIPTeam%2FEB\\_WbCUOx69HkrImUQat\\_UBE9d3-mGwp16QrCddZshrXg%3Fe%3DR80dTC&data=05%7C01%7Cdkemp%40doe.k12.ga.us%7C581797cd9bcf4f375a2708da2219feb6%7C1aa55c8303434ecbbd39bd7f43876bd7%7C0%7C0%7C637859792284570756%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWlJoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=EEYiRPxUFq8kPXpj9jUdnHseRkFR75dmZnhPyCFLRe0%3D&reserved=0](https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/ap/w-59584e83?url=https%3A%2F%2Fshealy.sharepoint.com%2F%3Aw%3A%2Fs%2FSSIPTeam%2FEB_WbCUOx69HkrImUQat_UBE9d3-mGwp16QrCddZshrXg%3Fe%3DR80dTC&data=05%7C01%7Cdkemp%40doe.k12.ga.us%7C581797cd9bcf4f375a2708da2219feb6%7C1aa55c8303434ecbbd39bd7f43876bd7%7C0%7C0%7C637859792284570756%7CUnknown%7CTWFPbGZsb3d8eyJWlJoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6lk1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=EEYiRPxUFq8kPXpj9jUdnHseRkFR75dmZnhPyCFLRe0%3D&reserved=0)

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

Georgia has revised targets for the SiMR and added targets to include 2023-2025 in the evaluation plan and noted student assessment data was not available for FFY2019. Georgia's baseline remains FFY 2017 at 63.20%

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

Georgia has added dates to include 2023-2025 in the evaluation plan and noted student assessment data was not available for FFY2019. Because the State has changed the formula for calculating Annual Event Graduation Rates, the annual targets were set to increase every two years rather than annually. This was based upon stakeholder input and survey.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

Georgia did not implement any new infrastructure improvement strategies. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the State decided to focus on previously identified strategies and to expand efforts that promoted virtual and on demand access to professional learning, print and digital resources, and technical assistance. As described in subsequent sections of this report, new on-demand and virtual professional learning modules were provided to districts based upon stakeholder engagement and district surveys. The State implemented three coherent improvement strategies to improve effective instruction, engaging school climate, and student outcomes in the ten SSIP/TSI districts.

**Coherent Strategy 1: Professional Learning** Georgia provided professional learning on the following topics: Selecting, Implementing and Monitoring EBPs with Fidelity, Implementing an Early Warning System with Fidelity, Check and Connect Mentor Training, IEP (Individualized Education Program), Specially Designed Instruction, Co-Teaching, School Completion Toolkit, Best Practices Webinar, MTSS PL Series, Transition and Assistive Technology, School-Based Administrator webpage and professional learning series/academy with mixed reality simulation, Teacher Retention Program and HLP training program. 9,948 participants from across the state attended the professional learning events. 745 (77%) district/school personnel attended the bimonthly SSIP webinars from March 2021- December 2021. Post evaluation data indicated 97% indicated the training was of high quality and useful to the Student Success SSIP work. 82% of attendees showed improvement in knowledge and skills on topics, exceeding the 74% target. 86% reported the State trainings were of high-quality; 91% reported the trainings were useful, relevant, and improved educator practices; 81% reported the PL improved their skills related to improving instruction, school climate, and student outcomes.

Coherent Strategy 2: Digital Tools and Resources Resource Guides: The School Completion Toolkit, websites for HLPs and Inclusive Leadership; guides for Distance Learning, Collaborative Planning, School Leadership Team, and Teacher Tools Newsletters and Family Engagement One Pagers were created. These resource guides, listed above, were developed, and disseminated to all districts in Georgia. There were 3,672 page views of the School Completion Toolkit with Select Interventions being the most used section. 86% of selected districts reported the digital and print resources were useful, relevant, and improved knowledge and skills around graduation, student achievement and the SSIP work.

Coherent Strategy 3: Technical Assistance and Coaching: 412 collective support technical assistance and coaching meetings were held to support districts. 45% (187/412 sessions) of all technical assistance and coaching was completed with district effectiveness partners. The coaching focus and technical assistance was planned by both SSIP and school improvement program specialist working together. In previous reporting, collaboration was 23%. According to the Annual District Survey, 91% of selected districts reported collective supports between the DSESS and SDE were highly effective and provided high-quality relevant supports and resources. 91% of selected districts reported that collaboration with DSESS (Division for Special Education Services and Supports) (Division of Special Education Services and Supports) and SDE should continue. 100% of stakeholders surveyed agree collaboration should continue. 88% of the special education directors reported it gave them an open door to work with other departments for Student Success and 86% of selected districts/schools reported the SSIP Program Specialists were effective and provided high-quality professional learning, technical assistance and coaching that changed practices for student success. 67% of selected districts/schools reported District Effectiveness Specialist were effective and provided high quality technical assistance and coaching that changed practices for student success. 100% of selected districts/schools and stakeholders agree the SSIP PL Series should continue and supports for building leaders should be developed. All stakeholders surveyed agree the focus of SSIP should remain on graduation but also provide professional learning for student achievement in literacy and mathematics. Other areas of need noted on the Annual District Survey and Stakeholder Engagement Feedback Survey were more training for building level leaders, how to engage students, assistance with recruiting and retaining special education teachers, teaching how to implement SDI (Specially Designed Instruction) and help with IEP implementation.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Georgia utilized its comprehensive SSIP Evaluation Plan to inform all evaluation activities and to frequently obtain data necessary for Georgia's State MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports) Implementation team to adjust implementation, including decisions regarding the continued implementation of improvement strategies. These strategies are research and evidence-based and have proven to build a sustainable system. Data sources included quantitative data (attendance and academic proficiency) collected by the GaDOE (Georgia Department of Education), data collection tools developed by OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and customized tools including surveys, checklists, rubrics, and pre/post-tests. These tools support the systems framework to promote accountability/monitoring and provide relevant professional development and technical assistance. The measures are used to build capacity and sustainability.

For Coherent Improvement Strategy 1, pre/post-tests, participant surveys, Annual District Survey and attendance records were used to assess implementation progress and outcomes. Data was collected to promote accountability and monitoring and address professional learning.

For Coherent Improvement Strategy 2, District Annual Survey and the Resource Development Log were used. District surveys and stakeholder feedback indicated a need for more digital resources and tools for districts. 100% of resources were completed in a timely manner. The State will continue to develop high quality professional learning resources with a focus on virtual learning resources and resources to improve student achievement.

For Coherent Improvement Strategy 3, Resource development logs, District Annual Survey, PL event documents, District Plan of Supports, Regional TA (Technical Assistance) surveys, and coaching logs were used to assess implementation progress and outcomes.

Data supports the decision to continue each of the improvement strategies. District staff are pleased with professional learning, technical assistance, and resources, but have clearly expressed a need for continued support to build sustainability and continue to increase graduation rates and student achievement.

Short-Term Goals:

Improve practitioner (district and school) knowledge of data-based decision making and selection and use of evidence-based practices.

- 82% of post scores exceeded the 74% target.
- 82% of selected districts requested customized professional learning.
- 79% reported technical assistance and coaching was useful, relevant and of high quality.
- 91% of selected districts reported professional learning was of high-quality.
- 89% reported the trainings were relevant, useful, and changed educator practices.
- 89% reported the resources and tools were useful and relevant.

Improve district and school infrastructure to support educators in implementing evidence-based practices to support teaching and learning.

- 89.6% of selected districts reported high levels of collaboration among district and the State team members on district annual surveys and stakeholder meetings, exceeding the 78% target.
- 100% of selected District Plan of Supports included specific strategies for addressing improvement in graduation rates and achievement for SWD (Students with disabilities).
- 85% of selected districts scored "Operational" or "Exemplary" on the Student Success District Team Fidelity Rubric scoring higher than target of 71%.

Increase engagement of stakeholders in planning, implementing, and monitoring improvement initiatives.

- 96% of district personnel reported engagement with other departments and regional technical assistance providers at collaborative/transformational levels exceeding the 88% target.
- 100% of the 10 selected districts participated in the SPP/APR and SSIP stakeholder meetings.

Mid-Term Goals:

Improve fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices to support teaching and learning for all students.

- 100% of the selected districts chose moderate/strong level of evidence EBPs to implement. This met the target goal.
- 89.6% of selected schools (25/28) were implementing EBPs at the full implementation level based upon District Plan of Supports Short Term Action Plans, Coaching Logs, monthly district meeting minutes, and benchmark data provided by the district exceeding the target of 67%.
- 47% were implementing EBPs with fidelity as measured by the GaDOE Implementation Fidelity Checklist for Evidence-Based Practices. 10/28 districts decided to change their EBPs in October 2021, so their fidelity of implementation was lower. The State did not meet the 50% target goal.

Improve school climate including student attendance, engagement, and behavior to 45% School Climate rating.

- 50% of selected schools scored a 4 or 5 on the STAR Climate Rating from 2019-2020. School Climate was not collected for FFY20 reporting

Improve academic proficiency of students with disabilities in selected districts and schools scoring developing or above on state assessments.

- State Assessment data: Georgia received a waiver from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education related to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) which waived accountability, school identification, and related reporting requirements (see <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Documents/ESSA/ga%20aact%20waiver%20response.pdf>). However, high stakes testing was not waived and resumed for all students, including students with disabilities, in the 2020-2021 school year. Students participating in virtual instruction were not required to report to a physical school facility for assessment participation if there were health concerns. The number of students participating in assessments was significantly

lower than previous years for all students. The participation rates and results reported for student assessment are not viewed to be an accurate representation of the achievement of students with disabilities. Decreased assessment participation rates for 2020-2021 are a direct result of COVID-19. Assessment results are likely a significant underrepresentation of the capabilities of Georgia's students with disabilities. Finally, Georgia's results on the assessments are not dramatically different from those obtained for students without disabilities and reflect the overall impact of COVID.

- Percentage of students with disabilities in districts selected to receive intensive supports scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment System for 2020-2021 was 5.33% for both ELA/ Math with 634 SWD out of 4,294 total students participating in state assessments from the 10 selected TSI/SSIP Districts/schools. The percentage of non-SWD students scoring developing or above on the Georgia Milestones Assessment was 11.01% for both ELA/Math.

- Percentage of students with disabilities in districts selected to receive intensive supports scoring proficient or higher on Georgia End of Course for 9th grade Literature and Coordinate Algebra for 2020-2021 was 6.34% (191 students) as compared to non-SWD with 5.90% (1,465 non-SWD students). Six of the selected TSI/SSIP schools scored higher on proficiency for SWD than all student groups for those schools. (Hollis-APS, Central HS-Bibb, Drew, and Morrow HS- Clayton, Clements MS, and South Salem Elem.-Newton).

- Improve academic proficiency of students with disabilities in selected districts and schools by closing the gap between students with disabilities and the all students' group.

- As indicated above, Georgia's assessment results were not representative of prior results.

- State assessment data provided on closing the gap between students with disabilities (SWD) and all students group was 5.68% gap difference. (All students group 11.01% proficiency rate/ SWD 5.33% proficiency rate = 5.68% difference). The results are a significant underrepresentation of the capabilities of Georgia's students with and without disabilities.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Based on data analysis, survey and stakeholder engagement, the State is building a statewide Early Warning System Dashboard for all districts to identify at-risk students who need interventions. The State will expand its SSIP PL series for teachers and administrators. A School-Based Administrator Academy is planned with monthly podcasts and Mixed Reality Simulations. The State is contracting with Dr. Tessie Rose Bailey and Americans Institute of Research (AIR) to provide ongoing training and resources for Specially Designed Instruction to support Student Success (SSIP). The State will continue to offer multi-sensory reading grants to identified districts with targeted support improvement and SSIP status.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Georgia did not prescribe specific evidence-based practices (EBPs) for selected districts and schools. Guidance and training on selecting EBPs was provided to all districts and tailored presentations presented to the 10 selected districts and schools. The EBPs the districts and schools chose were reviewed to ensure they met ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) and GA DOE level of evidence requirements. For this reporting period the following evidence-based practices were implemented: Check and Connect, Early Warning System, System 44, Achieve 3000, Lexia Core 5, SRA, Learning A-Z, Orton-Gillingham, Classworks and Townsend Press.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

4/28 schools (108 students) implemented Check and Connect a mentoring framework.

6/28 schools (166 students) implemented an Early Warning System, an at-risk indicator and intervention framework.

18/28 schools (795 students) implemented a strong-promising level of evidence reading intervention. The interventions ranged from Achieve 3000, Lexia Core 5, Learning A-Z, SRA, Orton-Gillingham, Classworks, and Townsend Press.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.**

Each EBP (Evidence Based Practices) supports the SiMR by providing strategies that address each school's root cause analysis needs found in their district data analysis. Each addresses the unique needs of each school. Check and Connect and An Early Warning System both address the emotional and academic achievement needs of students, change teacher practice, and build family engagement to support the SiMR. Each of the 7 reading interventions were chosen based upon data analysis and review to meet the achievement needs of the targeted students and to support change in teacher practices. The district level of interaction has moved from informing to collaborating and transforming.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

89.6% of selected schools (25/28) were implementing EBPs at the full implementation level based upon District Plan of Supports Short Term Action Plans, Coaching Logs, monthly district meeting minutes, and benchmark data provided by the district. Only 47% were implementing EBPs with fidelity as measured by the GaDOE Implementation Fidelity Checklist for Evidence-Based Practices. 10/28 schools decided to change their EBPs in October 2021, so their fidelity of implementation was lower. The State as part of the collective support provided by school and improvement and the Division for special education supports and services collects the following measures of success: District Team Implementation Fidelity Rubric with evidence, to support building capacity and sustainability in the district., Evidence-based Practice Fidelity Rubric is used to measure the implementation fidelity of EBPs., Benchmark data on EBPs, District Annual Survey, to measure the level of satisfaction the districts are with supports from the State to improve outcomes., State/Regional Technical Support Annual Survey, measures the rate of satisfaction around regional technical assistance and coaching, professional learning evaluation survey, measures the satisfaction level of participants with professional learning they receive, District Plan of Support Short Term Action Plan progress data measures how the districts are implementing their plan and meeting their expected outcomes, state assessment data on academic proficiency, annual event graduation rates, district benchmark data and anecdotal data from continuous improvement team meetings, measure increased student achievement and graduation rates.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

Check and Connect, a mentoring framework, implemented in four schools, showed from quarterly reports that there was a 41% improvement in attendance, 35% improvement in behavior and 67% increase in course completion. One school did not use Check and Connect to measure course completion. The average graduation rate was 66.1% in these schools.

Early Warning System benchmark data from six schools showed an average increase of 34% course completion rate and 59% increase in attendance.

The rate of implementation fidelity dropped from 79% to 49%. The ongoing changes in staff and the pandemic reduced the rate of implementation fidelity. The Annual Event Graduation Rate was 64.88% in these schools. Because previous SSIP reporting showed great improvement in the schools implementing an Early Warning System, the SSIP supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of this intervention. The SSIP will provide monthly targeted technical assistance and support to ensure fidelity measures improve. The school improvement team has also taken on more ownership and agree to be more intentional with implementation despite ongoing challenges. They have each assigned a point person to monitor implementation.

Classworks is an online tiered intervention solution that combines assessment, instruction, progress monitoring, and powerful reporting in one easy-to-use platform. Classwork benchmarks indicated all students are at the Beginning and Developing Level. The schools implementation began October 2021 so there is not any progress monitoring data.

System 44/Read 180 data for 86 students showed 51% at or above benchmark/performance expectations for decoding fluency and 62% at or above benchmark/performance expectations for comprehension for September 2021-December 2021. SSIP supports this intervention and its progress.

Lexia Core 5 implemented with 11 students reported a gain of .3 months from October 2021 to December 2021 which is below the expected benchmark goal of .6 months gain. Several of the students had breaks in school and changes in teachers. The implementation fidelity rate was 34% out of 100%. The school implementing Lexia Core 5 believes with a more focused approach to implementation the next benchmark data will show improvement. The school has assigned a point person to monitor implementation and report on progress at monthly improvement team meetings.

Achieve 3000 benchmark data indicated that students were engaged an average of 47 minutes per week vs the prescribed amount of 90 minutes per week. The average Lexile score increase was 78L and was below the expected benchmark target of 112L gain from September 2021-December 2021. The SSIP has encouraged a more focused monitoring on the implementation of this EBP. The district understands that it is important to implement the intervention with fidelity if they want to see the expected results. The SSIP will meet monthly with the point person assigned to monitor implementation to see if improvements are noted. If implemented with fidelity this intervention should show improved achievement.

Learning A-Z, a leveled reading instruction intervention for K-5 students was implemented with 142 students, progress monitoring data that showed 67% continue to read at the beginning level which is below the expected benchmark goal of 40%. Data showed an increase of 1.5% of students reading on or above grade level. The selected school has had a teacher shortage and changes in staff. Implementation Fidelity measures the program as only being implemented with 56% fidelity. The SSIP agrees to continue the support of this intervention with the following guidance recommended: Assign a point person to monitor fidelity of implementation weekly, progress monitor as prescribed by the program and ensure all teachers have been trained in implementing the intervention.

SRA reading, direct reading instruction for decoding, with 133 students began in December. The schools implementing, as of January 2022, were completing Winter 2021 data assessments. IReady Benchmark, completed Fall 2021, indicated 62% of the selected students were reading 2 or more grades below the expected goal. 38% were reading 1 grade below expected goal. The SSIP will continue to monitor this implementation and ask for progress data at each monthly improvement team meeting.

Townsend Press, an online reading intervention for grades 6-12 was implemented at 2 high schools with 200 students. NWEA MAP Assessments were completed as baseline data. One school scored 46%ile in ELA and 40%ile in Math. The other scored 35%ile in ELA and 29%ile in Math. Both schools scored below the expected benchmark goals of 56%ile in ELA and 58%ile in Math. Annual Event Graduation Rate is 76% which did exceed the 67% or higher benchmark in both schools. Implementation did not begin until November 2021, the SSIP will continue to support this EBP and monitor implementation fidelity to see if proves to provide increased student achievement.

Orton-Gillingham Reading, a multi-sensory reading intervention was implemented with 18 students showed a growth of 5.2% in oral reading words per minute on a given probe from May 2021- December 2021. The expected target was a 4% gain. The MAP benchmark scores showed an average range from 106-156 in Fall 2020 vs Spring 2021 average range 137-198.

#### **Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The State will continue to monitor the implementation fidelity and progress of each evidence-based practice and collect on-going quarterly benchmark data. Review of progress will continue to be discussed at the monthly district meeting. SSIP Program Specialists will ask districts to produce progress monitoring data and discuss as well as the level of implementation fidelity. Schools have assigned point person to monitor the implementation fidelity of each intervention. Districts have been encouraged to implement the interventions with fidelity and give them time to show progress before deciding to change them. The SSIP will also help ensure staff are trained and provided the necessary supports for implementation. With these strategies in place, the benchmark and rate of implementation fidelity is expected to be greater in the next reporting period.

### **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

#### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

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

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

The SAP includes representatives from:

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

SAP stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the SPP/APR Indicators and the development of targets for the 2020-2025 package on May 6, 2021, September 2, 2021, October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022. Beginning on May 6, 2021, the SAP was provided with a comprehensive overview presentation of the new SPP/APR 2020-2025 package and Indicators through a cohesive Indicators Cluster Group Framework developed by the Georgia Part B Data Managers. In the framework, SPP/APR Indicators were grouped together based upon similar objectives and intended outcomes for students. For example, Group A: High School and Life Outcomes Group included Indicators 1 (Graduation), 2 (Dropout), 13 (Secondary Transition), and 14 (Post School Outcomes). The presentation informed the SAP of the differences, if applicable, in measurement for Indicators in the new SPP/APR package. SAP viewed projected and historical data for the Indicators of the SPP/APR FFY 2020. If a new calculation and/or data group was used for an Indicator, such as Indicator 1 (Graduation), historical data was converted to allow for a comparable analysis of current and historical data. SAP was also provided with resources and links to access the information and the opportunity to ask questions. At the conclusion of the meeting, SAP members were provided with an opportunity to join a specific work group (shown below) for SPP/APR development.

The Indicators of the SPP/APR were divided into the following groups to enable focused work and greater opportunity for stakeholder feedback:

- Group A: High School and Life Outcomes (Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14 and 17)
- Group B: Disproportionality (Indicators 4, 9, and 10)
- Group C: Environments and Timelines (Indicators 5, 6, 11, and 12)
- Group D: Preschool, Parent Involvement, and Legal (Indicators 7, 8, 15, and 16)
- Group E: Assessment (Indicator 3).

On September 2, 2021, all SAP members worked in one of the five groups based upon self-selection. There was parent representation in each group. The small group sessions were facilitated by DSESS staff using a standardized format. Each facilitator was provided a presentation to share containing the following sections: Goals for the SPP/APR work group session, Indicators Cluster Group Framework, Collaborative Process for SPP/APR Development, Setting Baselines and Targets, Indicator Data, Stakeholder Requirements, and Preliminary Target Setting. Each group provided specific documented feedback on possible targets and lingering questions based on an analysis of the data. Follow-up sessions were conducted October 29, 2021, December 3, 2021, and January 13, 2022.

While the SAP continued to be an integral part of the development and input on the SPP/APR, there were many additional opportunities for parents, special educators, general educators, school level leaders, and LEA level leaders to participate in the input process for the SPP/APR 2020-2025. These opportunities included 9 virtual meetings with the following groups of stakeholders: parent mentors (required to be parents of a student with a disability), State Education Agency (SEA) special and general education instructional leaders and staff, LEA special and general education leaders and staff, higher education providers, Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS) special education technical assistance center personnel, parent to parent personnel, students with disabilities and former students with disabilities. The sessions dates began on August 4, 2021 and ended November 1, 2021. Registration records for these opportunities indicated that 1,473 individuals had an opportunity to participate in providing input on Georgia's data, targets, instructional strategies, and evaluation of progress. The format for the presentations was similar to that used in the SAP presentations. Specifically, virtual meeting participants were provided with current and trend data for the Indicators, informed of target setting strategies, and given the opportunity to provide feedback in setting the targets.

Following the completion of the November 1, 2021 LEA SPP/APR stakeholder session, feedback from all meetings, email, and questions was formatted into an online survey titled SPP/APR State Performance Plan Feedback Survey 2020-2025 posted at [https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx). The SPP/APR Survey gave participants the opportunity to select possible target increases or decreases for each Results Indicator. Survey participants were also provided with an open-ended response item to comment further on selected items and provide additional information. SAP members, parent mentors, and virtual meeting participants were provided with a link to the survey via email. GLRS directors also provided the link to general and special education personnel in their region. The SPP/APR Survey was publicly posted to allow for even broader participation. Following the collection of the survey, the results were used to set targets which were publicly posted for comment at the website above on December 7, 2021, except for Indicator 3. Indicator 3 assessment results and targets were made available following the January 13, 2022 SAP meeting. Assessment results were not broadly available in Georgia until after December 15, 2021, and the January SAP meeting was the first opportunity to receive stakeholder feedback on the Indicator 3 (Assessment) baselines and targets.

The SSIP stakeholders participated in the "All" stakeholder group activities listed above in the Introduction Description and the State Advisory Panel meetings on 8-6-21, 9-2-21 and 12-3-21. The State Advisory Panel, made of a diverse group of professionals and parents, is the primary stakeholder group. They provide ongoing input on the progress and focus of the SSIP and SPP/APR work. The State values the input of stakeholders and their involvement in decision-making. Under the leadership of the State Director of Special Education, the State Implementation Team will continue to identify ways in which to increase meaningful stakeholder engagement. The Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership, the GLRS, MTSS and other stakeholders have also attended the stakeholder meetings. During FFY20, all stakeholder meetings were conducted virtually. SSIP specific stakeholder meetings were held on the following dates and times: 10/29/2021, 9:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m.; 11/1/2021 2:00p.m.-3:00p.m. and 4:00p.m.-5:00p.m.; 11/3/2021 10:00a.m.-11:00a.m., 2:00 p.m.-3:00p.m.; 6:00p.m.-7:00p.m.

Stakeholders were involved in decision-making responsibilities related to the ongoing implementation and evaluation of the SSIP. 78 Stakeholders were given multiple ways to respond and communicate. Several virtual tools were used to gather input such as chat box, breakout rooms, small group discussions, surveys, Padlet, and virtual whiteboards. Each of the stakeholder groups had two opportunities to provide feedback.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

For FFY 20 all stakeholder engagement was conducted virtually using TEAMS. Stakeholders were invited via email, through SSIP/SDE points of contacts, Georgia's Parent Mentor Partnership, GLRS (GEORGIA LEARNING RESOURCES SYSTEM) and individual phone calls. Stakeholders were given multiple opportunities and ways to respond and provide feedback. Several virtual tools were used to gather input such as chat boxes, small group

breakout discussions, surveys, Mentimeter, Easy Retro, and virtual whiteboards. Each of the stakeholder groups had opportunities to provide suggestions regarding changes in improvement strategies and activities. In addition, stakeholders were invited to address concerns they had about the implementation activities or to make recommendations for improvement between meetings through phone and email communication. The SSIP has a webpage which posts SSIP guides, resources and tools to support the implementation of the SSIP. It publishes previous reports, ongoing professional learning opportunities, fidelity measures, logic model and evaluation plans. These resources and tools provide access to any stakeholder if they want to learn more about the SSIP work.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Continued concerns about student attendance, school-based administrators being novice to special education, and special education teacher retention continue to be concerns from stakeholders. The ongoing and ever-changing stressors of the pandemic are priority concerns. Many districts are also experiencing supply chain shortages for materials needed to implement evidence-based practices. The State is addressing prioritizing and addressing these issues. As stated above the state has implemented the teacher retention project to support the retention and training of new special education teachers. The SSIP is providing a School-Based Administrator Academy with mixed reality simulations to support novice administrators. The State stresses we are here to support schools and districts during these challenging times. Several professional learning resources have been created to support increasing engagement and attendance. The State reports on progress of addressing the issues to stakeholders on a regular basis.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

The State has no other activities to describe.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

The State has not identified any new barriers. Georgia continues to seek solutions to everyday challenges and provide support to districts.

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

## **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **17 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that revision. The State listed the baseline year as FFY 2017 under "historical data" and stated in the narrative that the baseline year is 2020. The State must account for this discrepancy.

OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given the discrepancy in the baseline data, as noted above. The State must ensure that its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement over the baseline.

## **17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

#### **Name:**

Wina Low

#### **Title:**

State Director

#### **Email:**

wlow@doe.k12.ga.us

#### **Phone:**

470.316.8636

#### **Submitted on:**

04/25/22 1:38:40 PM