

# GA Part B

# FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

**General Supervision System:**

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

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

The State provided appropriate accountability to ensure that Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) complied with federal regulations. Fidelity of compliant practices was enforced by using a tiered monitoring system that enabled the State to “monitor” all districts every year. Monitoring can be defined as “a continuing function or operation that uses systematic collection and analysis of data on specified indicators to provide management and stakeholders with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of targets and progress in continuous improvement.”

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

Tier 1 monitoring procedures were implemented for all districts in the state to enforce compliance and improve results. Tier 1 activities include a review of : District Determination Data, District Summary of APR Activities, District Improvement Activities, Continuation of Services Data, Fiscal Risk Assessment, Data Validation Checks and Dispute Resolution Data.

Tier 2 monitoring procedures were consistently implemented for a targeted group of districts, which were either triggered by Tier 1 data review, such as District Determinations data, or the Fiscal Risk Assessment data or by the Disproportionality Self-Assessment results, Fiscal Self-Assessment results, Record Review data, Desk Audit data or Data Verification and Audit data.

Tier 3 monitoring procedures were implemented for a targeted group of districts and differentiated to meet their compliance and/or performance needs, which were triggered by the previous tier's data or the State's monitoring cycle. In most instances, Tier 3 monitoring activities were conducted onsite. Although Records Review is an onsite activity, the monitoring of data is the same for the targeted group of districts. The monitoring activities at Tiers 2 and 3 provided the State with documentation to review district-level policies, procedures, and practices.

Tier 4 monitoring procedures were implemented for any districts that demonstrated difficulty in timely correcting noncompliance.

Based on the review of data from these components, the GaDOE ensured timely identification and correction of noncompliance that ultimately fostered a "continuous improvement monitoring process." Below is an explanation for several of the monitoring activities.

***Comprehensive Monitoring Activity*** - The Division for Special Education supported other Divisions in the State Department with an integrated monitoring of a targeted group of districts. The collaboration with the Office of School Improvement for the Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards (GAPSS) visits focused on the review of school and district standards. Districts for GAPSS visits were targeted based on a High Risk Status or by a request to the State for the review. These districts received onsite visits from a multidisciplinary team. In many cases, performance for SWD was an issue for these districts.

***Focused Monitoring*** - The State identified Residential Treatment Programs, Department of Juvenile Justice Facilities, Department of Corrections Facilities or other LEA entities that were on a cycle for monitoring or demonstrated a pattern of non-compliance for Focused Monitoring. The onsite team, led by compliance review staff, observed classrooms, reviewed records and conducted interviews to ensure the provision of free and appropriate public education to students with disabilities.

***Record Reviews*** - The State conducted Record Reviews to evaluate due process procedural compliance for local districts. The State reviewed records from all LEAs which included transition plans, and from identified LEAs for student support team records, eligibility reports and discipline records to ensure compliance with disciplinary due process procedures. The State used its records review process to obtain most data on appropriate transitional goals for Indicator 13.

***Active Engagement Process*** - The five step Active Engagement Process is designed to identify LEAs who need assistance in specific areas. This is done by helping them identify systemic problems, developing individualized remediation plans, supporting their work with specialized teams, and requiring documentation of compliance and improvement of student outcomes. The GaDOE Division for Special Education Services and Supports is committed to partnering with LEAs through the Active Engagement Process.

***Fiscal Monitoring*** - Federal regulations and general supervision administrative procedures require the State Educational Agency (SEA) to monitor high-risk programs. Georgia conducts a risk assessment annually to determine whether the LEA had a high-risk determination and required program monitoring and/or fiscal monitoring. For Fiscal Monitoring, the Division for Special Education assigns points to specified elements and combines those points with the Finance Budget Office (FBO) Risk Rating to determine each LEA's fiscal risk score. LEAs with a score of 0 to 25 points would be determined to be a low risk. Those LEAs with a score of 26 to 100 points would be determined to be a medium risk. Those LEAs with a score greater than 101 points would be determined to be at high risk. The goal for an LEA would be to have a low risk rating score. Intervention Risk Assessment Strategies were determined for each risk-rating group.

Those LEAs with a fiscal risk score of 101 or higher would be determined to be a high-risk district and require fiscal monitoring. LEAs within the following high-risk elements are automatically monitored regardless of the LEA's final fiscal risk score:

- Department decision to monitor the LEA.
- LEAs with fiscal irregularities or factors resulting in a return of special education funds.
- LEAs with the same fiscal finding two years in a row.

- LEAs with fiscal completion reports with a variance over 125% two years in a row.

**Data Verifications and Audits** - The Division for Special Education selected a sampling of districts to provide data verification based on certain risk factors. In these instances, the districts provided appropriate documentation to support valid and accurate data reporting practices. Although some monitoring procedures are in place for all districts, this level of verification impacted a target group of districts.

**Dispute Resolution** - The State provided desk audits to resolve issues of noncompliance as a part of the implementation of the dispute resolution processes. This 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 Self-Assessment** - The State administered the Disproportionality Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol to all districts identified as having some type of disproportionality determination. Based on the review of this data and any other pertinent documentation, the State used this information to inform identification of noncompliance.

**Timeline Reviews** - Timeline summary reports were submitted as a part of the required publicly reported data to the State last July. Each local district submitted a summary of its performance in meeting timelines for initial placements, eligibility redeterminations, and Babies Can't Wait (part C) preschool transitions that were completed during that fiscal year (July 1-June 30).

The following link provides additional information to Georgia's General Supervision processes: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-%28SPP%29%2c-Annual-Performance-Reports-%28APR%29-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx>

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**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.

The Division has made technical assistance (TA) a priority in order to facilitate program improvement throughout the state that is linked to the indicators and improvement activities as outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the correction of noncompliance. The State's comprehensive approach to TA enables the Department to differentiate the scope of services provided for districts based on local needs. TA provides a framework for local education agencies (LEA) to build their general supervision. Basic TA is a facilitation for change and includes providing documentation of evidence-based practices and disseminating examples of success to assist others in planning, implementation and use of tools to achieve positive outcomes. TA ranges from general levels, such as the state providing an overview/ review of best practices and/or general TA to Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA). TA available for all districts include monthly meetings with local districts, webinars to support compliant implementation of the IDEA, weekly updates via email, monthly directors' webinars, the Special Education Implementation Manual, and special education sample forms.

TTA would include more focused levels of support such as the State directing root cause analysis and monitoring of Corrective Action Plans (CAP) development and correction. It may also include assistance with data analysis, improvement planning, and 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/system/school levels.

To achieve these outcomes the collaboration often includes the Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), local colleges and universities and our national partners, to provide additional technical assistance to LEAs. In addition, the state uses the Active Engagement (AE) Process and Collaborative Communities facilitated by division staff to assist LEAs in identifying areas of need and implementing systemic change.

Active Engagement Process is a five step process designed to identify LEAs who need assistance in specific areas. This process helps them identify systemic problems, develop individualized remediation plans, support their work with specialized teams, and documentation of compliance and improvement of student outcomes.

The Collaborative Communities approach reflects a technical assistance model in which stakeholders are engaged in solving critical problems and supporting each other in their efforts. 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 in order to work together to accomplish common goals.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Professional Development System:**

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

Professional Development (PD) runs along a continuum at a basic level in providing general information to a more targeted and intensive PL which is job embedded, data driven school improvement in LEAs, schools and classrooms. Research suggests that in order to build capacity using a framework that includes understanding the stages of change process include: Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation, Full Implementation, and Sustainability and Innovation. This requires a system’s commitment to a multi-year process of improvement.

The Division of Special Education Services collaborates with many partners at the national, regional, state, and local levels to provide timely, accurate information about available professional development in special education. These collaborations often include the national technical assistance centers, the University of Kansas Transition Center (KU), the Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR) and local colleges and universities.

The Division’s PD encompasses many factors including what model and delivery method (job-related or job embedded) will be followed and the type of training. In addition, the PD is generally self-directed, based on previous experience, relevant to the needs and applicable in their specific situation. It is based on a “who needs to know what” model at the district, administrative, school or specialist’s level. The various delivery models for professional development include webinars, training module series, videos and face to face conferencing.

Some examples of these can be found at:

- Georgiastandards.org Resources and Videos: ( <https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx> )
- Professional Learning Resources for Teacher and Leader Effectiveness: ( <http://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Pages/Professional-Learning-Resources-for-Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness.aspx> )
- State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Professional Development Videos: ( <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Personnel-Development-Grant.aspx> )

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

Under the leadership of the State School Superintendent, Mr. Richard Woods, the Georgia Department of Education's (GaDOE) vision is to make education work for all Georgians. In moving toward this goal, GaDOE has core values of transparency, honesty, trust, respect, and collaboration. The overall vision and values have been apparent during the development of Georgia's State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) as we have sought and received broad stakeholder input.

To meet the need for a variety of stakeholder's input for the Division's initiatives and the State Systemic Improvement Plan, the Department of Education has participated in several trainings for Leading by Convening. As a result of using the principles in Leading by Convening, the state has been able to engage more stakeholders in the decision making process for the SPP and APR.

Among the stakeholders providing input for the new targets and activities for the SPP and APR through 2018 are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education. The SAP is comprised of the following members.

- Parents of children with disabilities, ages birth through 2
- Parent advocates
- Individuals with disabilities
- Local district educational administrators
- General and special education teachers
- Local district Special Education Directors
- GaDOE officials who carry out activities under subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act
- Representatives from:
  - The Department of Correction
  - A college/university that prepares special education and related services personnel
  - Part C, Babies Can't Wait
  - Private schools or Charter school
  - The Department of Juvenile Justice
  - Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation Agency (vocation/transition)
  - The Division of Family and Children Service
  - Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support
  - Parent Training and Information Center
  - Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education
  - Georgia School Superintendents' Association

In November of 2015 the SAP was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel as reported in the APR submitted in February 2015. Members were given the opportunity to review the targets for each indicator based on their recommendations in August 2014 and made suggestions for change to the State. This was conducted in a group discussion format and recorded for future consideration.

The State Director for special education also conducts listening sessions with a group of special education directors quarterly (Director's Forum). During these forums, feedback and input were also sought and received regarding many of the indicators, activities and targets. The State's initial flexibility waiver was approved by the United States Department of education (USDOE) on March 30, 2012. The new flexibility waiver approved June 2015 included the SSIP. The

combined input of each of these stakeholder groups was used to establish the targets for Indicators 1-14.

In September 2013, the Division for Special Education began its SSIP Phase I process by providing technical assistance for the State's Special Education Leadership team. More specific information regarding the State Systemic Improvement Plan will be provided under Indicator 17 in the April 2016 submission.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Reporting to the Public:**

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 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 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b) (1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

GaDOE reports annually to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting rigorous targets found in the SPP by providing a copy of its APR and an updated copy of the SPP on the department's website, available at SPP/APR Documents (<http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-%28SPP%29%2c-Annual-Performance-Reports-%28APR%29-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx>). These revised documents will be posted on the website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its Part B-APR on February 1, 2016, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §300.602. The SPP and APR will be distributed to the media and other public agencies.

Determinations about each local district are made annually in the fall of each school year. The GaDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of each Local Educational Agency (LEA) on the targets in the SPP at LEA (District) Reports (<http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StateId=ALL&T=0>) (Choose District Name→Special Education). The development of this public reporting mechanism is the result of ongoing collaboration between the Division for Special Education and Division for Information Technology within the GaDOE. By design, this information is embedded into the profile that has been provided for the last several years.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2014 and 2015 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 30, 2015 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2014 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2016, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

The State provided the required information.



**Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2015 and 2016 is Needs Assistance.

In the State's 2016 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities.

The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2015 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2017, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.



## Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%		35.70%	47.40%
Data		32.40%	32.93%	37.74%	41.40%	44.38%	43.30%	35.20%	35.20%	35.09%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	53.20%	54.00%	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%

Key:

### Explanation of Changes

The ESEA Flexibility waiver approved in June 2015 did not provide additional AMOs for the subgroup graduation rate. The state has revised the Indicator 1 targets based on analysis of the data from the 2014-2015 school year. The calculation of the 4-year cohort graduation rate has not been changed. For the 2014-2015 school year Georgia experienced a significant increase in the 4-year cohort rate. The 2014-2015 rate for SWD is 54.3%, a 17.8 percentage points increase. School districts in Georgia have worked diligently to increase the graduation rate for all students. The rate for all students increased by 6 percentage points, from 72.5% to 78.5%. In Georgia, policy changes require that all students satisfy the requirements for graduation which includes earning a minimum of 23 credits in specific content areas, but are no longer required to take and therefore not required to pass the GA High School Graduation Test. There has been no change in the cohort graduation rate calculation.

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for graduation rate are set by the State's ESEA Flexibility Waiver through 2016. The new Flexibility Waiver was approved June 2015. In November 2015 the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel as reported in the APR submitted in February 2015. Other stakeholders providing input for the targets are Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revision to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	5,027	

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	13,780	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	<a href="#">2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	36.50%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
5,027	13,780	35.09%	53.20%	36.50%

**Graduation Conditions Field**

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) holds high expectations for all students and strives to raise the graduation rate of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEP) who receive regular education diplomas through improved instructional programs and access to the general curriculum. Georgia has defined a graduate as a student who leaves high school with a Regular Diploma (this does not include Certificates of Attendance or Special Education Diplomas) in the standard time (i.e., 4 years). Graduates are students who have met course and assessment criteria. Depending on the year of ninth grade entry, students must complete the high school program of study and meet testing requirements set forth by the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE). Georgia offers one diploma for all students. The links below provide information for the appropriate requirements.

- Testing: (<http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/State-Board-of-Education/SBOE%20Rules/160-3-1-.07.pdf>)
- Graduation: (<http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/AskDOE/Pages/Graduation-Requirements.aspx>)

The State is reporting data from the 2013-2014 school year. This represents lagged data based on OSEP's requirement to use data as reported to the United States Department of Education (USED) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for ESEA in the adjusted cohort graduation rate. Georgia is reporting a 2013-2014 graduation rate for SWD of 36.5% for the SPP/APR (submitted February 2016). This rate represents the 4 year cohort rate. For the 2014-2015 school year Georgia experienced a significant increase in the 4-year cohort rate. The 2014-2015 rate for SWD is 54.3%, a 17.8 percentage points increase. School districts in Georgia have worked diligently to increase the graduation rate for all students. The rate for all students increased by 6 percentage points, from 72.5% to 78.5%. In Georgia, policy changes require that all students satisfy the requirements for graduation which includes earning a minimum of 23 credits in specific content areas, but are no longer required to take and therefore not required to pass the GA High School Graduation Test. There has been no change in the cohort graduation rate calculation.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

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

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			5.70%	5.60%	5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.90%
Data		6.10%	5.77%	5.27%	5.80%	5.50%	5.80%	6.15%	6.00%	5.68%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.90%	5.80%	5.70%	5.60%	5.50%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revisions to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of Students with IEPs ages 14-21 who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of Students with with IEPs in grades 9-12	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,579	60,662	5.68%	5.90%	5.90%

Use a different calculation methodology

Change numerator description in data table

Change denominator description in data table

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

The dropout rate calculation is the same for students with and without disabilities. The State used the dropout data for FFY 2013 that was used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and followed the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. The calculation is the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) in grades 9-12 with a withdrawal code corresponding to a dropout divided by the number of SWD in grades 9-12. Withdrawal codes corresponding to dropout are as follows: 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. As a result, the number reported in the "Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14- 21)" reflects the total SWD enrollment in grades 9-12 during the same reporting period.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			74.34%	73.34%	75.34%	77.34%	79.34%		45.50%	41.50%
Data		61.62%	51.44%	52.60%	55.80%	36.25%	50.30%	44.39%	41.40%	35.57%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	42.00%	43.00%	43.50%	44.00%	44.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revision to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

Yes  No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

AYP  AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
201	null	null	35.57%	42.00%	

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

Indicator 3A is not applicable for FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**



**Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			98.54%	98.54%	98.75%	98.75%	98.75%		98.90%	98.40%
			Data		98.82%	99.40%	99.14%	99.17%	99.31%	99.80%	98.70%	98.40%	99.18%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			98.53%	98.53%	98.75%	98.75%	98.75%		97.70%	97.70%
			Data		98.82%	99.12%	99.11%	99.19%	99.30%	99.26%	98.00%	97.70%	98.95%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	98.40%	98.45%	98.45%	98.50%	98.75%
Math	A ≥ Overall	97.70%	97.75%	97.75%	97.80%	98.25%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revision to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA’s performance on each indicator.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
------------	------------------------------	--	----------------	------------------	---------------

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	112,610	110,565	99.18%	98.40%	98.18%

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	114,527	111,209	98.95%	97.70%	97.10%

**Explanation of Group A Slippage**

Georgia has transitioned to a new statewide assessment called the Georgia Milestones. The new assessment transitioned from the use of Integrated Math 2 scores to using Geometry. Not all local districts have made this transition. Therefore, all students in HS with an IEP may not have taken the Geometry assessment which is used for accountability. Students who did not participate in the Geometry assessment may have participated in the Integrated Math 2 assessment. This may account for our slippage in participation.

**Public Reporting Information**

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

GaDOE reports annually to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting rigorous targets found in the SPP by providing a copy of its APR and an updated copy of the SPP on the department's website, available at SPP/APR Reports ( [http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) ). These revised documents will be posted on the website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its Part B-APR on February 1, 2015, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §300.602. The SPP and APR will be distributed to the media and other public agencies.

Determinations about each local district are made annual in the fall of each school year. The GaDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of each Local Educational Agency (LEA) on the targets in the SPP at LEA (District) Reports ( <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StateId=ALL&T=0> ) (Choose District Name→Special Education). The development of this public reporting mechanism is the result of ongoing collaboration between the Division for Special Education and Division for Information Technology within the GaDOE. By design, this information is embedded into the profile that has been provided for the last several years.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Elementary/ Middle	2011	Target ≥						69.00%	70.00%		79.50%	81.60%
			Data						70.11%	73.90%	80.40%	81.10%	82.12%
	B HS	2011	Target ≥									62.70%	66.40%
			Data								61.70%	63.20%	64.45%
Math	A Elementary/ Middle	2011	Target ≥						55.00%	56.00%		69.80%	72.90%
			Data						54.23%	64.00%	64.70%	65.40%	63.69%
	B HS	2011	Target ≥									37.70%	10.30%
			Data								31.50%	37.60%	17.69%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Elementary/Middle	16.77%	16.87%	17.00%	17.50%	18.00%
	B ≥ HS	12.28%	12.30%	12.80%	13.30%	13.80%
Math	A ≥ Elementary/Middle	15.42%	15.90%	16.40%	16.90%	17.40%
	B ≥ HS	11.07%	11.57%	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%

Key:

**Explanation of Changes**

Georgia’s commitment to providing a truer picture of student achievement was a paramount consideration in the development of the new assessment. In the 2014-2015 school year, Georgia changed assessments to the Georgia Milestones. The change was made because the former testing programs no longer met the needs of students, parents, schools, and districts. Georgia Milestones, comprised of End of Grade tests for grades 3-8 and End of Course for High School, replaced each of the following individual tests: the Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT), End of Course Tests (EOCT), and the Georgia Writing Assessments. Georgia Milestones, in addition to multiple choice items, now includes open-ended test items which allow students to demonstrate more clearly what they know.

Georgia Milestones provides a more accurate view of student performance based on more rigorous standards. The test contains four Achievement Levels rather than three (except the alternate assessment) as was the case with the previous assessments.

- **Beginning Learners:** These students do not yet demonstrate proficiency in the knowledge and skills necessary at this course of learning, as specified in Georgia’s content standards and need substantial academic support to be prepared for the next grade level or course. (Counted as “Not Proficient” when reporting SPP/APR)
- **Developing Learners:** These students demonstrate partial proficiency in the knowledge and skills necessary at this course of learning, as specified by Georgia’s content standards and need additional academic support to ensure success in the next grade level or course. (counted as not “Proficient” when reporting SPP/APR)
- **Proficient Learners:** These students demonstrate proficiency in the knowledge and skills necessary at this course of learning, as specified in Georgia’s content standards and are prepared for the next grade level or course. (counted as “Proficient” when reporting SPP/APR)
- **Distinguished Learners:** These students demonstrate advanced proficiency in the knowledge and skills necessary at this course of learning, as specified in Georgia’s content standards and are well prepared for the next grade level or course. (counted as “Proficient” when reporting SPP/APR)

Georgia’s students with significant cognitive disabilities are assessed using the Georgia Alternate Assessment (GAA). The GAA is a portfolio of student work that enables the demonstration of achievement and progress relative to selected skills that are aligned to the Georgia curriculum. The portfolio is used to capture student learning and achievement/progress in four content areas: English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. This assessment program promotes a vision of enhancing capacities and integrated life opportunities for students who experience significant cognitive disabilities. The GAA is administered to students in grades 3-8 and grade 11. The GAA continues to have three achievement levels as in past years, Level 1, Emerging, Level 2, Established, and Level 3 Extending. Levels 2 and 3 scores are reported as “Proficient”.

Scores from Georgia Milestones cannot be compared to those provided by Georgia’s previous tests because they are different from those provided for the CRCT and EOCT. The state-level results of the Georgia Milestones did, in fact, indicate that fewer students in Georgia scored as “Proficient”. The achievement standards (expectations) recommended by Georgia educators for Georgia Milestones simply reflect the greater demands of today’s academic, college, and career settings and the stiff competition that students will face as they move into their post-secondary experiences and/or the workforce after high school.

The state included the all students' data sets from the FFY 14 Georgia Milestones assessment in order to provide a context for the SWD subgroup scores. It should be noted that the significant decline in proficiency rates is reflected in the all students' data across all grade levels and represents a similar gap to FFY 13 proficiency data.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Targets for assessment are set by the state's ESEA Flexibility Waiver. The State's initial flexibility waiver was approved by the United States Department of Education (USDOE) on March 30, 2012. The new flexibility waiver was approved June 2015. However, targets for assessment have not been set. In addition, Georgia did not have the data for the new statewide assessments when it met with the various stakeholder groups since our last submission. Therefore, Georgia will convene meetings with stakeholder groups prior to the clarification period and will revise the targets at that time.

**In response to OSEP's comments concerning missing targets through FFY 2018, the targets have been set through FFY 2018 and are reflected in the Target template for both Reading/Language Arts and Math in grades 3-8 and high school.**

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Elementary/ Middle	98,195	16,472	82.12%	16.77%	16.77%
B HS	10,173	1,249	64.45%	12.28%	12.28%

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Elementary/ Middle	95,346	14,705	63.69%	15.42%	15.42%
B HS	11,667	1,291	17.69%	11.07%	11.07%

**Public Reporting Information**

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

GaDOE reports annually to the public on the State's progress and/or slippage in meeting rigorous targets found in the SPP by providing a copy of its APR and an updated copy of the SPP on the department's website, available at SPP/APR Reports ( [http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-\(SPP\)-Annual-Performance-Reports-\(APR\)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx](http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/State-Performance-Plan-(SPP)-Annual-Performance-Reports-(APR)-and-Annual-Determinations.aspx) ). These revised documents will be posted on the website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its Part B-APR on February 1, 2015, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1416(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §300.602. The SPP and APR will be distributed to the media and other public agencies.

Determinations about each local district are made annual in the fall of each school year. The GaDOE reports annually to the public on the performance of each Local Educational Agency (LEA) on the targets in the SPP at LEA (District) Reports ( <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StateId=ALL&T=0> ) (Choose District Name→Special Education). The development of this public reporting mechanism is the result of ongoing collaboration between the Division for Special Education and Division for Information Technology within the GaDOE. By design, this information is embedded into the profile that has been provided for the last several years.

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

Targets for assessment are set by the State's Flexibility Waiver. Georgia does not have targets for FFY 2015-2018 because they have not been since the new waiver was approved in June 2015. In addition, Georgia did not get the new assessment data until recently and was unable to convene stakeholders to set those targets until targets are set by the waiver. Georgia will convene meetings with stakeholder groups prior to the clarification period and will revise the targets at that time.

The state included the all students' data sets from the FFY 14 Georgia Milestones assessment in order to provide a context for the SWD subgroup scores. It should be noted that the significant decline in proficiency rates is reflected in the all students' data across all grade levels and represents a similar gap to FFY 13 proficiency data.

**In response to OSEP's comments concerning missing targets through FFY 2018, the targets have been set through FFY 2018 and are reflected in the Target template for both Reading/Language Arts and Math in grades 3-8 and high school.**

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

The State revised its targets for FFYs 2014 through 2018 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because the State's end targets for FFY 2018 do not reflect improvement over the FFY 2011 baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2018 targets to reflect improvement.

**Required Actions**

The State must revise its FFY 2018 targets to reflect improvement over the FFY 2011 baseline.

### Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			4.37%	3.83%	3.83%	3.28%	3.28%	10.00%	9.50%	4.50%
Data		6.56%	4.89%	0.54%	0.54%	0%	10.22%	5.21%	3.00%	4.50%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.40%	4.30%	4.20%	4.10%	4.00%



Key:

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revisions to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

#### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

-  Number of districts in the State
-  Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
5	198	4.50%	4.40%	2.53%



**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

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
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

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

*Georgia's Definition of Significant Discrepancy:* The rate of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities (SWD) for greater than 10 days in a school year was defined as: (1) a suspension N size  $\geq 5$  and (2) a suspension/expulsion relative risk  $\geq 2.0$  for 2012-2013 and  $\geq 2.0$  for 2013-2014.

**Calculation for Significant Discrepancy:**

***Georgia's Suspension and Expulsion Relative Risk:***

(((Focus District # of SWD with greater than 10 days Out-of-School Suspension (OSS)) Divided by (Focus District Total SWD Age 3/21))

Divided by

(State # of SWD with greater than 10 days OSS Divided by State SWD Age 3/21)]

**Georgia's Comparison Methodology:** Georgia compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) among Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the State.

In response to OSEP's response about not being able to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size, Georgia's response is that 14 districts did not meet the state identified "N" size.

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

The number of school districts in the state changes annually based on the addition and removal of charter districts. This indicator reports the number of districts for the 2013-2014 SY. For FFY 13 the state reported 198 districts. Therefore, this indicator is reporting 198 districts.

In response to OSEP's response about not being able to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size, Georgia's response is that 14 districts did not meet the state identified "N" size. the1qr2ekl

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Based on 2013-2014 data reported in FFY 2014 SPP/APR, 5 out of 198 districts were identified as having a significant

discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for >10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The State required the districts to complete a Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol to review policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance. Each district convened a Self-Assessment team to rate the district’s performance. Districts were required to demonstrate 100% proficiency on all indicators represented in the Discipline Focus Areas of the Self-Assessment. The State required each district with significant discrepancy to attend a Disproportionality Forum to verify policies, practices and procedures related to this area. As a result of this verification, 1 out of the 5 districts were identified as having noncompliance related to the significant discrepancy. The State identified the district as having noncompliance and required the district to make timely correction of the noncompliance within one year of the notification. The State required the district to review and revise their policies, practices, and procedures for discipline. The district indicated noncompliance in a number of areas, including the following: procedure for monitoring suspensions of SWD at the district level, use of positive behavioral intervention and supports, appropriate development of Behavioral Intervention Plans, appropriate use of functional behavioral assessments, etc. The GaDOE identified the level and nature of noncompliance for the district to develop a targeted technical assistance plan to ensure timely correction. The Division for Special Education staff reviewed and approved the district’s Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the district identified with significant discrepancy. The district also attached the CAP in their consolidated application. Correction of noncompliance for this district will be reported in the FFY 2015 APR.

- 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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:
  - The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The GaDOE identified the level and nature of noncompliance for the district to develop a targeted technical assistance plan to ensure timely correction. The Division for Special Education staff reviewed and approved the district’s Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the district identified with significant discrepancy. The district also attached the CAP in their consolidated application. Reviews of the progress on the CAP initiatives are conducted monthly with the district. The State verified that the districts (1) were 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) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

- The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The districts were required to create a Corrective Action Plans (CAP) that addressed the non-compliance and for the revising of policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancy. The implementation of the CAP was monitored monthly by the Division staff.

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

The State conducted the review required by 34 CFR §170(b) and identified 1 of the 9 districts as having noncompliance by June 30, 2014. The district received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to make correction of the noncompliance. The district submitted appropriate documentation to the state to verify timely correction no later than one year. The State verified that the district was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a state data system; and (2) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0.53%	2.15%	0.52%	4.10%	1.50%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
8	3	198	1.50%	0%	1.52%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

**Georgia's Definition of Significant Discrepancy:** The rate of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities (SWD), by race and ethnicity, for greater than 10 days in a school year was defined as: (1) a suspension N size  $\geq 5$  and (2) a suspension/expulsion relative risk  $\geq 2.0$  for 2012-2013 and  $\geq 2.0$  for 2013-2014.

### Calculation for Significant Discrepancy:

*Georgia's Suspension and Expulsion Relative Risk:*

(((Focus District # of SWD, by race and ethnicity, with greater than 10 days Out of School Suspension (OSS)) Divided by (Focus District Total SWD, by race and ethnicity Age 3/21))

Divided by

((State # of SWD with greater than 10 days OSS) Divided by (State SWD Age 3/21))]

**Georgia's Comparison Methodology:** Georgia compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) among Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the State.

In response to OSEP's response about not being able to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size, Georgia's response is that all districts met the state identified "N" size for one or more racial/ethnic categories for Significant Discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of school districts in the state changes annually based on the addition and removal of charter districts. This indicator reports the number of districts for the 2013-2014 SY. For FFY 13 the state reported 198 districts. Therefore, this indicator is reporting 198 districts.

In response to OSEP's response about not being able to determine whether any districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size, Georgia's response is that all districts met the state identified "N" size for one or more racial/ethnic categories for Significant Discrepancy.

The "all races and ethnicities were included in the review" box has been checked.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

Based on 2013-2014 data reported in FFY 2014 SPP/APR, 8 out of 198 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions for >10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The State required the districts to complete a Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol to review policies, practices, and procedures relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance. Each district convened a Self-Assessment team to rate the district's performance. Districts were required to demonstrate 100% proficiency on all indicators represented in the Discipline Focus Area of the Self-Assessment. The State required the 8 districts with significant discrepancy to attend a Disproportionality Forum to verify policies, practices and procedures related to this area. As a result of the verification, 3 districts were identified as having noncompliance related to the significant discrepancy. The State identified the districts as having noncompliance and required the districts to make timely correction of the noncompliance within one year of the notification. The State required the districts to review and revise their policies, practices, and procedures for discipline. The districts indicated noncompliance in a number of areas, including the following: procedure for monitoring suspensions of SWD at the district level, use of positive behavioral intervention and supports, appropriate development of Behavioral Intervention Plans and appropriate use of functional behavioral

assessments. The GaDOE identified the level and nature of noncompliance for the districts to develop a targeted technical assistance plans to ensure timely correction. The Division for Special Education staff reviewed and approved the district's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA. The districts also attached the CAP in its consolidated application.

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

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The GaDOE identified the level and nature of noncompliance for the districts to develop a targeted technical assistance plan to ensure timely correction. The Division for Special Education staff reviewed and approved the districts' Corrective Action Plan for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA. The districts also attached the CAP in their consolidated application. Reviews of the progress on the CAP initiatives are conducted monthly with the district. The State verified that the districts (1) were 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) have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The districts were required to create Corrective Action Plans (CAP) that addressed the non-compliance and for the revising of policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancy. The implementation of the CAP was monitored monthly by the Division staff.

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

The State identified thirteen districts with significant discrepancy by race. The State required the 13 districts to convene district level teams to complete the Self-Assessment Monitoring Protocol regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports or procedural safeguards. After providing a review of the districts' policies, practices, and procedures, the State made a finding of noncompliance for 3 of the 13 districts. The noncompliant districts demonstrated noncompliant practices as they related to the following areas: (1) Development and implementation of Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), (2) Appropriate use of a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA), and (3) Use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. The districts received written notification of the noncompliance and were required to timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. The State verified that the district (1) was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State

data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2014 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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 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 2014.

### Required Actions



**Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			57.00%	59.00%	61.00%	63.00%	65.00%	65.00%	67.00%	65.00%
		Data		54.30%	55.43%	60.00%	61.00%	61.83%	62.70%	63.74%	64.60%	64.88%
B	2005	Target ≤			19.00%	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%	14.00%	13.00%	14.50%
		Data		19.40%	19.66%	16.70%	16.40%	15.63%	15.07%	14.78%	14.60%	14.50%
C	2005	Target ≤			0.90%	0.90%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	2.00%
		Data		1.40%	1.62%	1.91%	2.00%	2.42%	2.32%	2.26%	2.40%	2.02%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.10%	65.20%	65.30%	65.40%	65.50%
Target B ≤	14.40%	14.30%	14.20%	14.10%	14.00%
Target C ≤	1.80%	1.70%	1.60%	1.50%	1.38%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revision to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
--------	------	-------------	------	----------------

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	178,323	177,844
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	115,368	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	25,897	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	2,788	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	598	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	396	null

**Explanation of Alternate Data**

The total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 which we report does not include parentally placed private school students. Districts in Georgia reported 470 students who were parentally placed in private school. Therefore, the total is 177,844 students instead of 178,323 students. The 178,323 student total prepopulated in the table above included the parentally placed private school students.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	115,368	177,844	64.88%	65.10%	64.87%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	25,897	177,844	14.50%	14.40%	14.56%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,782	177,844	2.02%	1.80%	2.13%

**Explanation of C Slippage**

The increase in 5C may be the result of an increase in students with disabilities eligible for and served in hospital/homebound settings. In FFY 2013, 277 students were served in hospital/homebound. In FFY 2014, that number increased to 396 students served.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									47.00%	45.60%
		Data									46.00%	45.50%
B	2011	Target ≤									21.00%	24.40%
		Data									22.60%	24.20%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	45.80%	46.00%	46.20%	46.40%	46.60%
Target B ≤	24.00%	23.00%	23.50%	23.00%	22.50%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revision to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	17,725	null

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">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</a>	7,838	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	4,195	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	67	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	5	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,838	17,725	45.57%	45.80%	44.22%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,267	17,725	24.37%	24.00%	24.07%

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

**Explanation of A Slippage**

There has been an increase of 197 students in the State's early childhood enrollment. This growth in the preschool population may have occurred in regional areas where there is less opportunity for participation in inclusive settings for young children.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2008	Target ≥						70.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	78.35%
		Data					68.70%	70.30%	78.80%	76.30%	76.20%	78.36%
A2	2008	Target ≥						59.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	61.40%
		Data					57.10%	57.10%	60.80%	60.30%	61.30%	61.42%
B1	2008	Target ≥						66.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	81.00%
		Data					63.90%	74.20%	81.80%	80.20%	81.40%	81.03%
B2	2008	Target ≥						27.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	36.70%
		Data					24.90%	27.70%	33.00%	35.30%	36.70%	36.70%
C1	2008	Target ≥						73.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	77.35%
		Data					71.20%	69.20%	79.20%	76.00%	76.30%	77.38%
C2	2008	Target ≥						68.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	71.45%
		Data					65.70%	66.60%	69.70%	70.80%	71.00%	71.49%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	78.40%	78.50%	78.50%	78.60%	78.60%
Target A2 ≥	61.50%	61.60%	61.70%	61.80%	62.00%
Target B1 ≥	81.10%	81.20%	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%
Target B2 ≥	36.90%	37.00%	37.10%	37.20%	37.30%
Target C1 ≥	77.50%	77.70%	77.90%	78.00%	78.00%
Target C2 ≥	71.50%	71.70%	71.90%	72.00%	72.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revisions to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's

performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	0.00
--	------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	99.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	808.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1931.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1844.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2595.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3775.00	4682.00	78.36%	78.40%	80.63%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	4439.00	7277.00	61.42%	61.50%	61.00%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	79.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	953.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3156.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2364.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	723.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	5520.00	6552.00	81.03%	81.10%	84.25%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	3087.00	7275.00	36.70%	36.90%	42.43%



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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	111.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	629.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1376.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1835.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3324.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	3211.00	3951.00	77.38%	77.50%	81.27%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	5159.00	7275.00	71.49%	71.50%	70.91%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This comment is to explain the difference in the totals represented in A2, B2 and C2. In one district, 2 fewer students were reported for Outcomes B2 and C2 than were reported for Outcome A2. Nineteen (19) students were reported for B2 and C2 and 21 students were reported for A2 resulting in the two different totals (7,275 and 7,277 respectively).

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

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))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	44.00%
Data		32.00%	30.00%	27.00%	30.00%	36.00%	39.00%	39.00%	40.00%	44.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	44.50%	45.00%	45.50%	46.00%	46.50%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revision to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
5689.00	12368.00	44.00%	44.50%	46.00%

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.

Elementary schools in the state of Georgia include grades PreK-5 programs. Therefore, the Pre-K programs were included in the elementary school surveys. The sampling process is described in the methodology section.

**Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.**

The attachment contains charts and narratives that describe how the State has ensured that response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

**Was sampling used?** Yes

**Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?** No

**Was a collection tool used?** Yes

**Is it a new or revised collection tool?** No



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

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

The State utilized the survey developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to determine the percentage 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. The Research and Evaluation Unit of the state assisted in the development of the sampling plan.

In FY 2006, the State implemented a stratified, random, cluster sampling method to ensure the sample was representative of Georgia's special education student population. The sampling occurred at the school level. The goal of the sampling method was to place every school in Georgia in one of five equivalent Yearly Sample Groups (YSG). Each year, all the schools in a given YSG will be selected for the sample. The following steps outline how the YSGs are determined:

Steps in the sampling process:

A data file with the following elements will be produced

1. School name and code
  - a. district name and code
  - b. district size indicator: unique indicator for each school district with a total enrollment > 50,000
  - c. school type: elementary, middle, or high
  - d. special education student enrollment
  - e. percent economically disadvantaged (ED): defined as percent of students who qualify for free/reduced price lunch
  - f. percent ethnic minority: defined as percent of non-white student
2. Schools are assigned a district size indicator. For example, a code of 1 is given to the first large district, 2 for the second and so forth. Schools that do not come from a district with 50,000 or more students are assigned a code of zero.
3. Schools are also assigned a value to indicate one of three school type groups: elementary (1), middle (2), and high school (3). Elementary schools are those that include grades PreK-5, middle schools include grades 6-8, and high schools include grades 9-12. If a school does not fall into one of the above grade ranges, it will be placed in the school

type category that most closely matches (e.g., a school covering 6-9 would be categorized as a middle school). Schools that cannot be categorized in such a manner will be randomly assigned a group (e.g., a school covering grades PreK-12).

4. A random number is generated for all schools, and the list is resorted in descending order by the following order of precedence: district size indicator, school type indicator, enrollment, percent ED, percent minority, and random number.
5. Using the school list ordered as described in step 4, all schools are assigned an YSG group of 1-5 based on the order they appear in the list. That is, every fifth school will be in the same YSG.

This will ensure all the large districts are represented in each YSG. It will also ensure that elementary, middle, and high schools are equally distributed among the YSGs. Finally, each YSG should be as similar as possible with respect to the sample size and representation on the demographic indicators described above.

1. The last step in the process is to verify the sample. Verification will involve at a minimum the following.
  - a. First, each YSG will be reviewed to make sure all districts of 50,000 or more are in each YSG. This should be the case as long as each large district has at least five schools. Initial review of the data shows this to be the case.
  - b. Second, each YSG will be evaluated to ensure that it is comparable to the state population on ED and percent minority. A 5% rule will be used to evaluate comparability. That is, the percent ED and percent minority in each YSG should differ from the state by no more than 5%. If differences are >5%, the sample will be adjusted to correct for this. YSG adjustments will follow this process
    - i. The school with the highest percentage on the category being adjusted will be moved from the YSG that is highest on that indicator to the YSG that is lowest and vice versa. This will continue until all YSGs are within 5% or as close as possible.
    - ii. Adjustments will be made in such a manner as to ensure that each YSG retains representation of districts with 50,000 or more students.
      - a. Each YSG will be checked to ensure all disability types are represented. If any disability type is not represented in YSG, the sample will be adjusted as described above.
      - b. When districts do not return an appropriate sample size of their survey, the State and contractor will contact them so that further surveys can be requested.
      - c. The number of surveys distributed annually will allow each district to be reported at least once after the first year, and all districts over 50,000 students will be reported annually. The selection will also allow a representative sample of the state annually so that the state data may be reported annually as required.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.50%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	201	0.50%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The State defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) Relative Risk Ratio for two consecutive years {FFY 2013,  $\geq 3.0$  and FFY 2014,  $\geq 3.0$ } and (2) SWD Subgroup  $\geq 15$ .

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia uses a Relative Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  calculated for 2 consecutive years to determine significant disproportionality

with a minimum “n” size of 15. All districts in Georgia meet the minimum “n” size for at least one racial/ethnic subgroup, therefore, all districts were considered. Georgia has developed a Special Education Dashboard which enables districts to view their data and understand how their relative risk ratio is calculated.

The "all races and ethnicities were included in the review" box has been checked.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.26%	2.71%	1.08%	1.07%	3.23%	2.63%	3.55%	4.00%	6.00%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
19	8	201	6.00%	0%	3.98%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

### Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

The State defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in specific disability categories by using the following criteria: (1) (1) Relative Risk Ratio for two consecutive years {FFY 2013,  $\geq 3.0$  and FFY 2014,  $\geq 3.0$ } and (2) SWD Subgroup  $\geq 15$ .

The State uses a comprehensive Self-Assessment to review local policies, procedures, and practices that ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Self-Assessment addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation must attend an onsite forum to review evidence and supporting documentation for the Self-Assessment. The Division for Special Education conducts this review and ultimately determines if there are findings of noncompliance. If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 8 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies.



Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Georgia uses a Relative Risk Ratio of  $\geq 3.0$  calculated for 2 consecutive years to determine significant disproportionality with a minimum “n” size of 15. All districts in Georgia meet the minimum “n” size for at least one racial/ethnic subgroup, therefore, all districts were considered. Georgia has developed a Special Education Dashboard which enables districts to view their data and understand how their relative risk ratio is calculated.

The State uses a comprehensive Self-Assessment to review local policies, procedures, and practices that ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Self-Assessment addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation must attend an onsite forum to review evidence and supporting documentation for the Self-Assessment. The Division for Special Education conducts this review and ultimately determines if there are findings of noncompliance. If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and timely correct the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 8 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies.

The "all races and ethnicities were included in the review" box has been checked.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
12	10	2	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State convened a team of colleagues to review the sampling of eligibility reports for compliant practices based on the evaluation and eligibility rules. It was expected that the new sampling would demonstrate compliant practices. After reviewing the sampling, the State provided additional feedback on the districts' progress and held teleconferences with the districts to share the findings. If additional technical assistance was needed, the GaDOE made onsite visits to the districts and held teleconferences and webinars to provide additional support for correction of noncompliance. The State continued to review subsequent data until the LEAs demonstrated compliance and all individual incidences of noncompliance were corrected.

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

In FFY 2013, twelve districts were identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. Ten districts have corrected the noncompliance within one year of written notification and two districts have subsequently corrected non-compliance. The districts were asked to submit a sampling of eligibility reports developed since the noncompliance determination for review by the State. All 12 districts received written notification of noncompliance with specific provisions of the Part B regulations during FFY 2012. The State verified timely correction of noncompliance for all districts: (1) required the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to change policies, practices, and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance; (2) determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02. The State considered additional documentation of policies, practices, and procedures as cited during other monitoring (e.g., Records Review, Focused Monitoring, etc.) for Georgia’s Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP).

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that the eight districts identified in FFY 2014 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 CFR §§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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 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 2014.

### Required Actions

**Indicator 11: Child Find**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.50%	88.28%	89.13%	94.00%	96.43%	97.39%	97.80%	97.70%	98.28%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
33,105	32,582	98.28%	100%	98.42%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	523
---	-----

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.

Eligibility determinations for 523 students were not completed within 60 days. This number represented 1.58% of all eligibility determinations in FFY 2014. This was a decrease from 566 in FFY 2013.

The range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed are bulleted below:

- 184 eligibility determinations were completed 1-10 days after 60 days (48.2%).
- 100 eligibility determinations were completed 11-30 days after 60 days (26.2%).
- 45 eligibility determinations were completed 31-60 days after 60 days (11.8%)
- 53 eligibility determinations were completed 60+ days after 60 days (13.9%).

Districts completed 98.42% of evaluations in a timely manner in FFY 2014. The analysis of the 1.58% of the evaluations that were delayed included the following reasons:

- student delays (excessive absences, withdrawal and re-enrollment) (2.6%)
- parent delays (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner) (26.2%)
- teacher/evaluator delays (teachers not following through, lack of psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech-language pathologists) (51.3%)
- district errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policies and procedures) (10.5%); and
- other reasons (9.4%)

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used**

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.**

The State reviewed the child find data of each school district to ensure timely initial evaluations. Each district submitted a timeline report by July 31. Georgia has a 60-day requirement from receipt of consent to eligibility determination. Based on 09-02 OSEP Memo, Georgia identified noncompliance for this area. The State notified all districts that reported less than 100% compliance for their child find obligation. The districts were required to submit additional documentation to verify correction. Georgia issued letters of noncompliance for districts that were not able to provide documentation to support that evaluations were completed. The State will report on the correction of this noncompliance in the FFY15 APR due February 1, 2017.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
566	566	0	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State required that districts include corrective action in their consolidated applications, and the State verified

completion of corrective action activities with each district that was noncompliant. Correction of all noncompliance was verified no later than one year after districts were provided written notification of noncompliance. The State verified timeline reports for noncompliant districts through updated timeline logs for districts that were identified as noncompliant. All findings of noncompliance for timelines were corrected within one year of written notification. The State verified timely correction of noncompliance for all districts: (1) required the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to change policies, practices and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance; (2) determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)Memorandum 09-02.

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

Correction of all noncompliance was verified no later than one year after districts were provided written notification of noncompliance. The State verified timeline reports for noncompliant districts through updated timeline logs for districts that were identified as noncompliant. All findings of noncompliance for timelines were corrected within one year of written notification. The State verified timely correction of noncompliance for all districts: (1) required the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to change policies, practices and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance; (2) determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)Memorandum 09-02.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

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))

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		85.50%	84.40%	96.30%	98.00%	98.31%	98.50%	99.20%	98.80%	98.80%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,870
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	713
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,029
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.	104
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	3,029	3,053	98.80%	100%	99.21%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	24
--	----

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

A total of 3,870 young children transitioning from Part C to Part B were determined eligible and had IEPs prior to third birthday; however, 24 eligibilities did not receive consideration prior to their third birthday. The number of days beyond the third birthday for these determinations ranged between 1 and 60+ days. The reasons for these delays, as reported by

districts, included parent refusals, district errors, hearing and vision screening problems, and evaluation delays. The number and percentage of students affected is outlined below.

- 1-10 days delayed: 10 students (41.7%)
- 11-30 days delayed: 7 students (29.2%)
- 31-60 days delayed: 5 students (20.8%)
- More than 60 days delayed: 2 students (8.3%)

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

The State reviewed the young children transition data of each school district to ensure children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Each district submitted a young children transition report by July 31. Based on 09-02 OSEP Memo, Georgia identified noncompliance for this area. The State notified all districts that reported less than 100% for this indicator. The districts were required to submit additional documentation to verify correction. Georgia issued letters of noncompliance for districts that were not able to provide documentation to support that evaluations were completed.

As a result of verifying noncompliant data, all districts demonstrated that the noncompliance had already been corrected. The State verified correctio of noncompliance for those districts and issued a clearance letter to the superintendents.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

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

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State required that districts include corrective action in their consolidated applications, and the State verified completion of corrective action activities with each district that was noncompliant. All findings of noncompliance for timelines for young children transition were corrected within one year of written notification. The State verified timely

correction of noncompliance for all districts: (1) required the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to change policies, practices and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance: (2) determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02.

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

Correction of all noncompliance was verified no later than one year after districts were provided written notification of noncompliance. The State verified correction for noncompliant districts. All findings of noncompliance for timelines for young children transition were corrected within one year of written notification. The State verified timely correction of noncompliance for all districts: (1) required the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to change policies, practices and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance: (2) determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02.

**OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

**Required Actions**



### Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

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 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))

#### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					85.80%	5.50%	31.50%	60.10%	94.50%	94.98%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

#### FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2014 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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,211	3,305	94.98%	100%	97.16%

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

To meet the requirements of the SPP, all districts were required to completed the Transition Planning Survey for their district. The surveys were completed via the MyGaDOE Web Portal which collects the data for this indicator. The survey contains three separate collections:

- Collection 1 - An initial review by the district to ensure compliance of randomly selected individual student transition plans (5 to 50 students contingent upon district size)
- Collection 2 - State review of individual student transition plans to verify the compliance ( a minimum of 1 to 5 students contingent upon district size and all district reported non-compliant plans), and

- Collection 3 - Correction of non-compliance (if required).

The initial collection (Collection 1) was conducted between November 2014 and December 2014. An electronic date stamp verifies successful timely transmission. Surveys not completed by the assigned due date adversely affected the district's timely and accurate determination.

In Collection 1, an IEP that included the Transition Service Plan and related components was considered compliant if all components of the survey are reported as Y (Yes) or NA (Not Applicable, if allowable). Any component coded as N (No) represented non-compliance and the "All Areas in Compliance" section was reported as No. GaDOE reviewed all IEPs in which the All Areas in Compliance rating is No and randomly selected another 10% of the IEPs included in the survey for review. After data submission, each of the 10 survey components received an individual proficiency rating. Students who had withdrawn were excluded from the calculation. Components with an allowable value of NA were excluded from the component calculation.

Collection 2 requires the districts to upload Individual Student Transition Plans to the GaDOE portal during a ten day period in January 2015. The plans must be submitted to the Division for Special Education by midnight of the final day of the submission period. An electronic date stamp verifies successful timely transmission.

Once the transition plans are received division personnel and state designees trained to identify non-compliance in transition plans review the plans for compliance. The procedure in Collection 1 for rating the IEPs is also used for this collection.

In Collection 3, the state verifies the correction of non-compliance. Should additional non-compliance be found, the district continues to go through the process until all non-compliance is completed.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
163	163	0	0

**FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Districts that have had noncompliance are required to participate in technical assistance that provides opportunities to demonstrate compliant practices. In addition, since the State collects data for this indicator from every district annually, there are multiple opportunities to ensure that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

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

The State required periodic data submissions of each district. Staff of the Division for Special Education reviewed the documentation. Feedback and technical assistance were provided to each district following each documentation submission. In some instances, the periodic reviews included additional onsite visits. The State verified timely correction of noncompliance for all districts: (1) required the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to change policies, practices and/or procedures that contributed to or resulted in noncompliance; (2) determined that each LEA was correctly implementing the

specific regulatory requirements(s) for which they were found noncompliant; and (3) ensured that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, pursuant to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2014, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 for this indicator.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 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 2015 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 2014, although its FFY 2014 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2014.

### Required Actions

**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

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))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							28.00%	28.00%	28.00%	24.80%
		Data						27.23%	26.90%	24.70%	24.80%	24.78%
B	2009	Target ≥							53.00%	53.50%	53.50%	53.60%
		Data						51.46%	52.80%	52.50%	51.00%	53.64%
C	2009	Target ≥							79.00%	80.00%	80.00%	79.90%
		Data						77.08%	76.80%	76.30%	77.60%	79.95%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	24.80%	25.50%	26.25%	27.00%	27.40%
Target B ≥	53.60%	53.70%	53.70%	53.90%	54.00%
Target C ≥	79.90%	80.00%	80.00%	80.10%	80.10%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revisions to the SPP/APR. In addition, the State posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of the SEA and LEA's performance on each indicator. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	9232.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2252.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2708.00
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)	970.00
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).	1552.00

	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 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2252.00	9232.00	24.78%	24.80%	24.39%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	4960.00	9232.00	53.64%	53.60%	53.73%
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)	7482.00	9232.00	79.95%	79.90%	81.04%

**Was sampling used?** No

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

Each local school district is required to develop a mechanism for contacting all students with Individual Education Programs (IEP) who were reported as exiting (including graduates, dropouts, aged out, and others) to determine what their post-school activities were within one year of high school. Districts submit this data via the Georgia Department of Education (GADOE) secure portal during a window from June 1-July 31. The instructions for the survey include the State's Part B definitions for 14 as specified below.

**Definitions**

The following definitions are specific to the State's Part B Indicator 14:

- 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.
- Higher Education means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (2-year program), or college/university (4- or more year program) for at least one complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school.
- Some Other Employment 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.).
- Other Postsecondary Education or Training means youth enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one

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, or vocational technical school that is less than a 2-year program).

- Respondents are youth or their designated family member who answer the survey or interview questions.
- Leavers are youth who left school by graduating with a regular or modified diploma, aging out, leaving school early (i.e., dropped out), or who were expected to return and did not.

Data charts are provided in the attachments that indicate that the rate of response for each of the categories (disability, race, gender, English language learners) is representative of the demographics for Georgia's exiters.

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			88.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	62.70%
Data		88.00%	47.00%	50.00%	41.20%	52.50%	25.00%	49.00%	48.00%	62.71%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	62.70%	62.80%	62.90%	63.00%	63.10%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revision to the SPP/APR. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	39	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	62	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
---	-----------------------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

agreements				
39	62	62.71%	62.70%	62.90%

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**



**Indicator 16: Mediation**

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))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			66.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Data		62.90%	56.25%	58.90%	50.90%	68.85%	63.20%	50.00%	48.00%	63.27%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2014			2015			2016			2017			2018		
Target	50.00%	-	70.00%	50.00%	-	70.00%	50.00%	-	70.00%	50.00%	-	70.00%	50.00%	-	70.00%

Key:

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Among the stakeholders providing input for the targets and activities for the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) are the State Advisory Panel (SAP) for Special Education, Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, Division staff and personnel from other divisions within the Georgia Department of Education. At least yearly, stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes as well as making revisions to the SPP/APR. Additional information concerning stakeholders can be found in the Introduction of the SPP/APR.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	30	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	56	null

**FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

**FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

complaints	complaints				
4	30	56	63.27%	50.00% - 70.00%	60.71%

**Actions required in FFY 2013 response**

None

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		41.00%
Data	39.46%	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

### Description of Measure

See the attachment for Georgia's SSIP.

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

### Overview

**Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

**Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity**

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

*Statement*

*Description*

**Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

### Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

### Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

### OSEP Response

### Required Actions

--

## Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

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.

**Selected:** 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: Deborah Gay

Title: State Special Education Director

Email: dgay@doe.k12.ga.us

Phone: 404-326-0421