

GA Part B

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

207

General Supervision System:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tier 3 monitoring procedures were implemented for a targeted group of LEAs and differentiated to meet their compliance and/or performance needs, which were triggered by the previous tier's data or the Division's monitoring cycle. In most instances, Tier 3 monitoring activities were conducted onsite. Records Reviews may be an onsite activity or online if the LEA is participating in the Georgia Online IEP system. The monitoring activities at Tiers 2 and 3 provide the Division with documentation to review district level policies, procedures, and practices.

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

Focused Monitoring - The Division for Special Education Services and Supports 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 noncompliance 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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Record Reviews - The Division for Special Education Services and Supports conducted Record Reviews to evaluate due process procedural compliance for LEAs. The Division reviewed records from all LEAs which included IEPs and transition plans. From selected LEAs, the Division conducted Record Reviews to evaluate student support team records, eligibility reports and discipline records to ensure compliance with disciplinary due process procedures.

Active Engagement Process –The five step Active Engagement Process is designed to identify LEAs who need assistance in specific areas. The Active Engagement Process helps LEAs identify systemic problems, develop individualized remediation plans, and support work with specialized teams. The Process requires documentation of compliance and improvement outcomes. The GADOE Division for Special Education Services and Supports is committed to partnering with LEAs through the Active Engagement Process and supporting the work of the State Systemic Improvement Plan.

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

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

- LEAs showing evidence of serious or chronic compliance problems
- LEAs with previous financial monitoring/audit findings
- LEAs with a high number of complaints from parents and other stakeholders about program implementation
- Other LEAs as deemed necessary

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

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

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

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

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

The following link provides additional information regarding Georgia’s General Supervision processes:
<http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Georgia%27s-Continuous-Improvement-Monitoring-Process-%28GCIMP%29.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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The Division for Special Education Services and Supports has made technical assistance (TA) a priority 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 GADOE’s comprehensive approach to TA enables the Division to differentiate the scope of services provided for local education agencies (LEAs) based on local needs. TA provides a framework for LEAs to build their capacity for 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 Division providing an overview or review of best practices, to Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA), more intense support.

TA available for all LEAs includes monthly meetings with LEA staff, webinars to support implementation of the IDEA, weekly updates via email, monthly directors’ webinars, the Special Education Implementation Manual, and sample special education forms.

Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) includes more focused levels of support such as the GADOE directing root cause analysis and monitoring of Corrective Action Plan (CAP) development and correction. TTA may also include assistance with data analysis, improvement planning, 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 results in changes to policy, program, or operations that support increased capacity at the state, LEA, and school levels.

To achieve these outcomes, the collaboration often includes the Georgia Learning Resources System (GLRS), Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), local colleges and universities and our national partners, to provide additional technical assistance to LEAs. In addition, the Division 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.

The Active Engagement Process is a five-step process designed to identify LEAs who need assistance in specific areas. This process assists in the identification of systemic problems, the development of individualized remediation plans, supports the work with specialized teams, and documentation of compliance and improvement of student outcomes.

The Collaborative Communities approach is 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 to work together to accomplish common goals.

To support the state in addressing its needs assistance status, Georgia has continued to strengthen its relationship with Technical Assistance Centers including the Idea Data Center (IDC), the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DASY), and the National Center for Systematic Improvement (NCSI). A team from Georgia attended the Part B Cross State Learning Collaborative. Information and resources from this conference have informed the work of the SSIP regarding all aspects of improving the graduation rate for students with disabilities. Tools and resources available from IDC are used to assist in data analysis. Georgia has also collaborated with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to address the challenges of dropout prevention, improving graduation rates, and strengthening transition planning services.

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) may be at a basic level of providing general information to a more targeted and intensive level of learning which is job-embedded and data-driven focused on student achievement and school improvement.

Research suggests that to build capacity, a framework that includes understanding the stages of change process must be used. The stages of change are: Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation, Full Implementation, and

Sustainability and Innovation. This requires that a system commit 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 and accurate information about available professional development in special education. These collaborations often include the national technical assistance centers, the University of Kansas Transition Center (KU), the Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA), Georgia Learning Resource System (GLRS), Special Education Leadership Development Academy (SELDA), Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR) and local colleges and universities.

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

Some examples of these can be found at:

- Georgiastandards.org Resources and Videos: (<https://www.georgiastandards.org/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>)
- 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. 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.

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

The SAP has 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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Georgia School Superintendents' Association

The State Director for special education 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 the APR indicators, activities, and targets.

Georgia has received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for graduation and academic achievement for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup. Georgia's methodology to calculate graduation and achievement targets for the APR is similar to the methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The methodology for setting the targets for academic achievement was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed. A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students.

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 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

The GADOE provides data regarding students with disabilities in our state. The Annual Performance Report is posted on the Special Education webpage at the following link: <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> Here the viewer may see Georgia's APR for the current year and also previous years.

School districts' public reports of the APR is also available for public viewing. These documents can be found at the following link: <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StateId=ALL&T=0&FY=2016> The user must select the school district they would like to view and then select 'special education'. The user may also be required to toggle to the correct year to view the most recent APR data.

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

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2016 and 2017 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 28, 2017 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2018, 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.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR.

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	75.00%	80.00%	85.00%		35.70%	47.40%	53.20%
Data		32.40%	32.93%	37.74%	41.40%	44.38%	43.30%	35.20%	35.20%	35.09%	36.50%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	54.00%
Data	54.33%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	54.50%	55.00%	55.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Georgia has received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for graduation for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup. The targets for the APR will be set to mirror the ESSA plan targets. The methodology is: $(100 - \text{baseline year data}) \times .03 = \% \text{ increase for each year}$. The baseline year in Georgia's ESSA plan is FFY2016 data. Because FFY2015 graduation rates are being reported in this APR, Georgia will reset targets in the February 2019 submission of the APR when FFY2016 graduation data will be reported. The methodology for setting the targets for graduation was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed. A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students.

During the interim, stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the Indicators and the targets. In August, 2017, November 2017, and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, provided feedback, as well. At least annually, stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes. In addition, the Division for Special Education posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	7,843	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	13,859	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	56.59%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
7,843	13,859	54.33%	54.50%	56.59%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) holds high expectations for all students and works to raise the graduation rate of students with Individual Education Programs (IEP) who receive regular education diplomas. The GaDOE supports improved instructional programs and access to the general curriculum for all students. Georgia defines a graduate as a student who exits high school with a Regular High School Diploma (not a Certificate of Attendance or Special Education Diploma) in the standard time of 4 years. Graduates must have met course and assessment criteria. Georgia offers one diploma for all students. The links below provide information for the assessment and graduation requirements:

- 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>)

Georgia is reporting data from the 2015-2016 school year. This represents lagged data based on OSEP's requirement to report data as submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), the adjusted cohort graduation rate. Georgia is reporting a 2015-2016 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 56.59% for Students with IEPs in the SPP/APR submitted in February 2018. Georgia surpassed the FFY2016 target and increased the graduation rate by 2.26% for Students with IEPs.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≤			5.70%	5.60%	5.50%	5.40%	5.30%	5.20%	5.10%	5.90%	5.90%
Data		6.10%	5.77%	5.27%	5.80%	5.50%	5.80%	6.15%	6.00%	5.68%	5.90%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	5.80%
Data	5.60%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.70%	5.60%	5.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017, and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

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

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Total number of students with IEPs in high school that dropped out	Total number of students with IEPs enrolled in high school.	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3,594	64,179	5.60%	5.70%	5.60%

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 2015 which used the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			98.54%	98.54%	98.75%	98.75%	98.75%		98.90%	98.40%	98.40%
			Data		98.82%	99.40%	99.14%	99.17%	99.31%	99.80%	98.70%	98.40%	99.18%	98.18%
Math	A Overall	2011	Target ≥			98.53%	98.53%	98.75%	98.75%	98.75%		97.70%	97.70%	97.70%
			Data		98.82%	99.12%	99.11%	99.19%	99.30%	99.26%	98.00%	97.70%	98.95%	97.10%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	98.45%
		Data	99.14%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	97.75%
		Data	99.43%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	18766	19222	19504	17859	17083	16359	153	1553	8925	917	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4427	3577	3196	2162	1961	1986	23	238	1355	189	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12624	13895	14516	13906	13242	12364	112	1249	6733	686	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1548	1619	1676	1655	1755	1891			715		

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	18768	19225	19510	17863	17080	16307	9949	10429	2017	652	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4487	3578	3211	2165	1965	2025	1737	1702	184	122	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	12550	13886	14505	13891	13213	12247	7971	8430	1143	486	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	1548	1619	1676	1654	1755	1888			626		

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	120,341	119,300	99.14%	98.45%	99.13%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	131,800	130,264	99.43%	97.75%	98.83%

Public Reporting Information

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

The GADOE annually reports to the public the results of our state assessments for students with disabilities. Assessment data are reported at the State level, the local school district level and the school level. Data at the school level are suppressed at a cell size of 15. The data are available on the Special Education webpage at the following link titled Federal Data Reports: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx> These documents will be posted on the website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of the Part B SPP/APR on February 1, 2018. In addition to these reports, the LEA level assessment data is available on each school district's public report of their SPP/APR. This document reports data for each LEA on all the APR indicators, including assessment (3b and 3c). These documents can be found at the following link: <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StatelD=ALL&T=0&FY=2016> The user must select the school district they would like to view and then select 'special education'. The user may also be required to toggle to the correct year to view the most recent APR data.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

Georgia posted FFY2015 assessment participation data on the Georgia Department of Education website. LEA data are available on each LEA's public report at this link: <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StatelD=ALL&T=0&FY=2014>

The State and School level assessment participation data is posted at this link: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Elementary/ Middle	2016	Target ≥						69.00%	70.00%		79.50%	81.60%	16.77%
			Data						70.11%	73.90%	80.40%	81.10%	82.12%	16.77%
	B HS	2016	Target ≥									62.70%	66.40%	12.28%
			Data								61.70%	63.20%	64.45%	12.28%
Math	A Elementary/ Middle	2016	Target ≥						55.00%	56.00%		69.80%	72.90%	15.42%
			Data						54.23%	64.00%	64.70%	65.40%	63.69%	15.42%
	B HS	2016	Target ≥									37.70%	10.30%	11.07%
			Data								31.50%	37.60%	17.69%	11.07%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Elementary/ Middle	Target ≥	16.87%
		Data	16.89%
	B HS	Target ≥	12.30%
		Data	13.34%
Math	A Elementary/ Middle	Target ≥	15.90%
		Data	19.14%
	B HS	Target ≥	11.57%
		Data	12.51%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Elementary/Middle	17.66%	20.13%	22.60%
	B ≥ HS	15.73%	18.25%	20.78%
Math	A ≥ Elementary/Middle	19.97%	22.37%	24.77%
	B ≥ HS	11.59%	14.25%	16.90%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Georgia has received approval for its Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for achievement for all students, including students with disabilities. Georgia's accountability system is the College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI). The Division for Special Education will follow the methodology used in the CCRPI to determine targets for the APR, however the metrics are dissimilar. The FFY2016 data will be the new baseline for the APR just as it is for the CCRPI. Georgia's Milestones Assessment System reports 4 levels of proficiency. For the CCRPI calculations, only Full Academic year (FAY) students are included and a point system counts students who achieve at levels 2, 3, and 4 as proficient. APR data reported includes all students with disabilities (FAY and non-FAY) and only includes students performing at levels 3 and 4 as proficient. Therefore, the methodology is similar, but the result will be different for CCRPI and APR reporting. Note that the Georgia Alternate Assessment includes 3 levels; levels 2 and 3 are considered proficient.

Using Georgia's Math for elementary and middle school data as an example, the following is the calculation for targets:

FFY16 Baseline: 19.97% (actual achievement data; % of students with a proficient score)

Calculation: $.03 \times (100 - 19.97) = .03 \times 80.03 = 2.4\%$

FFY17 target = 22.37% (19.97% + 2.4%)

FFY18 target = 24.77% (22.37% + 2.4%)

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Georgia has received approval for its Every Students Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan which includes targets for academic achievement for all students including the students with disabilities subgroup.

Georgia's methodology to calculate achievement targets for the APR is similar to the methodology to calculate achievement targets for Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), our accountability system. The methodology for setting the targets for academic achievement was developed with extensive stakeholder input as the ESSA plan was developed. A State Advisory Committee was established to provide high-level direction and feedback to Georgia's ESSA working committees. The Committee was made up of forty individuals representing state agencies, organizations, nonprofit, education advocacy groups, policymakers, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students.

In August 2017, November 2017, and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education, provided feedback, as well. At least annually, stakeholders were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicators and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes. In addition, the Division for Special Education posts results annually and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	18599	19091	19388	17723	16958	16241	135	1487	8803	875	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1507	1410	1058	633	476	494		31	301	16	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	657	959	764	786	578	676	n	63	619	29	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1362	1420	1512	1480	1581	1716			715		

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	18585	19083	19392	17710	16933	16160	9708	10132	1953	608	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1966	1692	1119	696	705	607	365	347	11	7	
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1252	1351	882	877	948	932	564	627	38	12	
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	1407	1394	1415	1286	1372	1636			626		

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Elementary/ Middle	108,000	19,069	16.89%	17.66%	17.66%
B HS	11,300	1,777	13.34%	15.73%	15.73%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Elementary/ Middle	107,863	21,537	19.14%	19.97%	19.97%
B HS	22,401	2,597	12.51%	11.59%	11.59%

Public Reporting Information

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

The GADOE annually reports to the public the results of our state assessments for students with disabilities. Assessment data are reported at the State level, the local school district level and the school level. Data at the school level are suppressed at a cell size of 15. The data are available on the Special Education webpage at the following link titled Federal Data Reports: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>. These documents will be posted on the website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of the Part B SPP/APR on February 1, 2018. In addition to these reports, the LEA level assessment data is available on each school district's public report of their SPP/APR. This document reports data for each LEA on all the APR indicators, including assessment (3b and 3c). These documents can be found at the following link: <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StatelId=ALL&T=0&FY=2016>. The user must select the school district they would like to view and then select 'special education'. The user may also be required to toggle to the correct year to view the most recent APR data.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2015, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

Georgia posted FFY2015 assessment proficiency data on the Georgia Department of Education website. LEA data are available on each LEA's public report at this link: <http://archives.gadoe.org/ReportingFW.aspx?PageReq=211&PID=61&PTID=67&CTID=216&StatelId=ALL&T=0&FY=2014>

The State and School level assessment proficiency data is posted at this link: <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Special-Education-Services/Pages/Federal-Data-Reports-Sp-Ed.aspx>

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline and targets for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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: 2015

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.37%	3.83%	3.83%	3.28%	3.28%	10.00%	9.50%	4.50%	4.40%
Data		6.56%	4.89%	0.54%	0.54%	0%	10.22%	5.21%	3.00%	4.50%	2.53%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	18.52%
Data	18.52%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	17.50%	16.50%	15.50%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

The reporting requirement for Indicator 4a shifted from using all LEAs in the state in the denominator to using only LEAs that met the n-size (numerator). Georgia has set a minimum n-size size of 5 suspensions greater than 10 days. This eliminated 177 LEAs leaving the denominator at 27 instead of 204. This change in calculation also increased Georgia's % of LEAs that were significantly discrepant to 18.52%. 18.52% became the new balseine. Georgia shared this information with Stakeholders and set new targets for indicator 4a.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 177

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5	27	18.52%	17.50%	18.52%

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

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 Size ≥ 5 and (2) a suspension/expulsion relative risk ≥ 2.0 for 2014-2015 and ≥ 2.0 for 2015-2016.

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 6/21))

Divided by

(State # of SWD with greater than 10 days OSS Divided by State SWD Age 6/21)]

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.

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 2015-2016 school year. For FFY 2015, the state reported 204 districts. Therefore, this indicator is reporting 204 districts, 27 of which met the n-size.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

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

Based on 2015-2016 data reported in FFY 2016 SPP/APR, 3 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 Comprehensive Compliance Review 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 compliance Review 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 Compliance Review. 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, 0 out of the 3 districts were identified as having noncompliance related to the significant discrepancy.

If a district was identified as having noncompliance, the State would support the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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	null	0

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline and targets for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, and OSEP accepts that revision.

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0.53%	2.15%	0.52%	4.10%	1.50%	1.52%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n-size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 184

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 that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4	1	20	0%	0%	5.00%

Reasons for Slippage

The reporting of these data shifted from using all LEAs in the state in the denominator to using only the LEAs that met the n-size size in the denominator. Georgia has set an n-size size of less than or equal to 5 suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. This excluded 184 LEAs resulting in a higher percentage of districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to significant discrepancy.

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 Cell Size ≥ 5 and (2) a suspension/expulsion relative risk ≥ 2.0 for 2014-2015 and ≥ 2.0 for 2015-2016.

Calculation for Significant Discrepancy:

Georgia's Suspension and Expulsion Relative Risk:

$(((\text{Focus District \# of SWD, by race and ethnicity, with greater than 10 days Out of School Suspension (OSS)}) \text{ Divided by } (\text{Focus District Total SWD, by race and ethnicity Age 6/21})))$

Divided by

$(((\text{State \# of SWD with greater than 10 days OSS}) \text{ Divided by } (\text{State SWD Age 6/21})))$

Georgia's Comparison Methodology: Georgia compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
 children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) among Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the State.

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 2015-2016 school year. For FFY 2015, the State reported 204 districts. Therefore, this indicator is reporting 204 districts.
 One hundred eighty-four (184) LEAs did not meet the cell size of 5 for suspension count in at least one racial/ethnic group and were therefore not included.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

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

Based on 2015-2016 data reported in FFY 2016 SPP/APR, 3 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 Comprehensive Compliance Review 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 compliance Review 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 Compliance Review. 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, 0 out of the 3 districts were identified as having noncompliance related to the significant discrepancy.

If a district was identified as having noncompliance, the State would support the development of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for addressing the cited noncompliance and for revising policies, practices, and procedures related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with IDEA as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2016 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 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 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			57.00%	59.00%	61.00%	63.00%	65.00%	65.00%	67.00%	65.00%	65.10%
		Data		54.30%	55.43%	60.00%	61.00%	61.83%	62.70%	63.74%	64.60%	64.88%	64.87%
B	2005	Target ≤			19.00%	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%	14.00%	13.00%	14.50%	14.40%
		Data		19.40%	19.66%	16.70%	16.40%	15.63%	15.07%	14.78%	14.60%	14.50%	14.56%
C	2005	Target ≤			0.90%	0.90%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	2.00%	1.80%
		Data		1.40%	1.62%	1.91%	2.00%	2.42%	2.32%	2.26%	2.40%	2.02%	2.13%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	65.20%
	Data	64.89%
B	Target ≤	14.30%
	Data	15.04%
C	Target ≤	1.70%
	Data	2.07%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	65.30%	65.40%	65.50%
Target B ≤	14.20%	14.10%	14.00%
Target C ≤	1.60%	1.50%	1.38%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	190,541	190,003
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	122,475	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	28,715	null

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	2,751	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	567	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	430	null

Explanation of Alternate Data

The total number of children with IEPs aged 6-21 we are reporting (190,003) does not include parentally placed private school students. Districts in Georgia reported 538 students who were parentally placed in private school. Therefore, the total number of children with IEPs for this indicator is 190,003 instead of 190,541. The pre-populated data included the parentally placed private school students.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	122,475	190,003	64.89%	65.30%	64.46%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	28,715	190,003	15.04%	14.20%	15.11%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,748	190,003	2.07%	1.60%	1.97%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									47.00%	45.60%	45.80%
		Data								46.00%	45.50%	45.57%	44.22%
B	2011	Target ≤									21.00%	24.40%	24.00%
		Data								22.60%	24.20%	24.37%	24.07%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	46.00%
	Data	43.98%
B	Target ≤	23.00%
	Data	24.65%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	46.20%	46.40%	46.60%
Target B ≤	23.50%	23.00%	22.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	18,553	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,969	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,726	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	65	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,969	18,553	43.98%	46.20%	42.95%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,791	18,553	24.65%	23.50%	25.82%

Use a different calculation methodology

Reasons for A Slippage

The Preschool Environment data for 6a indicates slippage for Georgia. Georgia does not have universal preschool for 3 and 4-year-old children. LEAs are challenged to find a general education setting for young children, especially those who are 3 years old. Many of our LEAs are providing high quality services for young children with disabilities; the services are provided outside of the general education setting as there are a limited number of settings in which to include young children.

Reasons for B Slippage

The Preschool Environment data for 6b indicates slippage for Georgia. Georgia does not have universal preschool 3 and 4-year-old children. LEAs are challenged to find a general education setting for young children, especially those who are 3-years old. Many of our LEAs are providing high quality services for young children with disabilities; the services are provided in a small group special education classroom setting as there are a limited number of settings in which to include young children. The data reveal that the vast majority of young children represented in the count for indicator 6b are not in residential or separate school settings but in a special education classroom receiving appropriate services.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						70.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	78.35%	78.40%
		Data					68.70%	70.30%	78.80%	76.30%	76.20%	78.36%	80.63%
A2	2008	Target ≥						59.00%	61.00%	62.00%	63.00%	61.40%	61.50%
		Data					57.10%	57.10%	60.80%	60.30%	61.30%	61.42%	61.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥						66.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	81.00%	81.10%
		Data					63.90%	74.20%	81.80%	80.20%	81.40%	81.03%	84.25%
B2	2008	Target ≥						27.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	36.70%	36.90%
		Data					24.90%	27.70%	33.00%	35.30%	36.70%	36.70%	42.43%
C1	2008	Target ≥						73.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	77.35%	77.50%
		Data					71.20%	69.20%	79.20%	76.00%	76.30%	77.38%	81.27%
C2	2008	Target ≥						68.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%	71.45%	71.50%
		Data					65.70%	66.60%	69.70%	70.80%	71.00%	71.49%	70.91%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	78.50%
	Data	80.32%
A2	Target ≥	61.60%
	Data	65.58%
B1	Target ≥	81.20%
	Data	83.05%
B2	Target ≥	37.00%
	Data	48.53%
C1	Target ≥	77.70%
	Data	80.43%
C2	Target ≥	71.70%
	Data	74.85%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	78.50%	78.60%	78.60%
Target A2 ≥	61.70%	61.80%	62.00%
Target B1 ≥	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%
Target B2 ≥	37.10%	37.20%	37.30%
Target C1 ≥	77.90%	78.00%	78.00%
Target C2 ≥	71.90%	72.00%	72.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	7127.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	97.00	1.36%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	836.00	11.73%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1611.00	22.60%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1788.00	25.09%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2795.00	39.22%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	3399.00	4332.00	80.32%	78.50%	78.46%
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)	4583.00	7127.00	65.58%	61.70%	64.30%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

In FFY2015 Georgia reported data for this outcome of 80.32% exceeding the target. The FFY2016 target was 78.5%. Georgia is reporting FFY2016 data as 78.46% resulting in a decrease of 1.86% from the previous year and only .04% below the target. Georgia continues to experience an increase in the number of young children with Autism. Inherent in this area of disability is challenging social/emotional skills including the age appropriate development of social relationships. Early childhood special education service providers in Georgia continue to recognize and address the social/emotional needs of all children especially those identified as children with Autism.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	80.00	1.12%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1004.00	14.09%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2578.00	36.17%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2528.00	35.47%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	937.00	13.15%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	5106.00	6190.00	83.05%	81.30%	82.49%
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)	3465.00	7127.00	48.53%	37.10%	48.62%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	102.00	0.95%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	672.00	6.26%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1203.00	11.21%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1631.00	15.19%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	7127.00	66.39%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	-----------	-------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	2834.00	3608.00	80.43%	77.90%	78.55%
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. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	8758.00	10735.00	74.85%	71.90%	81.58%

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

Data for Indicator 7 are collected at the student level in each LEA that provides special education services to young children. No statewide assessment exists for young children (ages 3 and 4); therefore districts collect these data using tools such as observation tools, checklists, and standardized assessments such as the Brigance - Early Childhood. The state is in the process of creating a task force to revisit how these data are collected to provide guidance to the LEAs. GADOE Special Education leadership has received input from the State Advisory Panel and other stakeholders to guide this work.

Special education directors are provided a spreadsheet on which to enter their student level data. Student name, date of birth, program entry date, age of entry, entrance rating, duration of service and exit rating is entered for each preschool student. The spreadsheet then calculates the ratings for each of the 3 outcomes. Data is reported for children who have been in the preschool program for at least 6 months and exit the program to Kindergarten or turn six. Special education directors report these data in the Preschool Outcomes Application in the GADOE portal. The summary statements are automatically calculated for each outcome.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			34.00%	36.00%	36.00%	38.00%	40.00%	42.00%	44.00%	44.00%	44.50%
Data		32.00%	30.00%	27.00%	30.00%	36.00%	39.00%	39.00%	40.00%	44.00%	46.00%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	45.00%
Data	49.00%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

During the 2016-2017 Georgia implemented a new methodology to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirement. Previously Georgia used a sampling methodology which placed some of our schools on a 5-year rotation for participation.

The new Parent Survey allows all parents of children with disabilities ages 3-21 to participate in the survey. Together with stakeholders, 10 questions were developed (in addition to demographic information questions) to seek the level to which parents perceived the facilitation of involvement at their child's school. A copy of the survey is attached to Georgia's APR.

The survey administered for the first time in the 2016-2017 school year revealed a parental involvement percentage of 69% for Georgia. These data are 20% higher than the previous year and 23.5% above the target for FFY2016. Therefore, 69% will become Georgia's new baseline. GADOE staff has worked with Stakeholders to develop new targets for this indicator.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR.

During the 2016-2017, a new Parent Survey was used. The SAP was involved in developing the survey. The indicator 8 data were shared with the SAP and discussions were held regarding participation and results. The SAP participated in discussions which led to targets for the new survey.

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

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
13827.00	20039.00	49.00%	69.00%	69.00%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

0.00

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

During the 2016-2017 Georgia implemented a new methodology to gather data to satisfy the Indicator 8 reporting requirement. Previously Georgia used a sampling methodology which placed some of our schools on a 5-year rotation for participation.

The new Parent Survey allows all parents of children with disabilities ages 3-21 to participate in the survey. Together with stakeholders, 10 questions were developed (in addition to demographic information questions) to seek the level to which parents perceived the facilitation of involvement at their child's school. The survey is publicized by each LEA and the GADOE so that all parents of children with disabilities including parents of children in preschool may respond to the survey. The data from the parents of preschool children is included with the data reported for all parent responses. Of the respondents who reported the grade level of their child, 1,124 were preschool. 19,792 of the 20,039 respondents reported a grade level; therefore 5.7% of respondents were parents of children with disabilities in preschool programs.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

Describe the strategies the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

FFY2016 was the first year that Georgia changed the way in which the Indicator 8 data was collected. A shift was made to provide all parents of children with disabilities the opportunity to respond to the survey. An online survey was created; paper copies were available upon request.

The parent survey data show that the percentage of responses were higher from parents of children with Autism and Speech Language Impairment; responses were commensurate or lower for all other areas of disability. 3.94% (790) of respondents did not designate the disability category of their child and therefore are not included in the chart above. LEA level data have been shared with each Special Education Director. SEA staff and Parent Mentors have worked and will continue to work with Special Education Directors to provide strategies for increasing participation in the survey in FFY17 across all demographic groups.

These data reveal that a higher percentage of parents of white SWD responded to the survey compared to percentage of white SWD enrolled. A lower percentage of parents of black and Hispanic SWD responded to the survey as compared to black and Hispanic SWD enrolled. Although a Spanish version of the survey was available both online and paper format, it is clear that increased efforts must be made to publicize the availability of the survey to all families.

The data is being further analyzed, by region and LEA to determine why a lower percentage of parents of black students participated in the survey. Certain regions of the state have limited personal access to technology (the Internet) and therefore increased efforts are being made to provide technology to families at meetings and community events. Also, paper copies are made available when necessary.

The initial year for an online survey revealed challenges. The benefits of moving to an online survey far outweigh the challenges. The survey provides data that are much more usable to directors, school leaders and teachers. To increase participation across all demographics the GADOE and LEA directors are sharing results with school level staff and encouraging teachers to provide opportunities to families at IEP meetings, PTA, meetings, conferences, etc. Sharing the real-time participation data that is available on the Special Education Dashboard helps LEA directors know where to focus their efforts to increase participation.

The GADOE conducts webinars, provides training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE), and provides information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation across all demographics.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Georgia's percentage of parental involvement rose to 69% from 49% in the previous year. The number of responses increased from 12,583 in FFY2015 to 20,039 in FFY2016. Georgia is working with stakeholders to set new targets for this indicator.

These data were analyzed to examine the demographics of the parents responding. Attached is a chart, FY Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, that shows the comparison between the disability area of children enrolled in Georgia in FFY16 and the disability category of the children whose parents responded

These data show that the percentage of responses were higher from parents of children with Autism and Speech Language Impairment; responses were commensurate or lower for all other areas of disability. 3.94% (790) of respondents did not designate the disability category of their child and therefore are not included in the chart above. LEA level data have been shared with each Special Education Director. SEA staff and Parent Mentors have worked and will continue to work with Special Education Directors to provide strategies for increasing participation in the survey in FFY17 across all demographic groups.

These data were also examined to compare the state's enrollment by race/ethnicity and the parents' responses by race/ethnicity. The attached chart, FY17 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, displays this comparison. Note that not all parents reported their race/ethnicity category when responding to the survey.

These data reveal that a higher percentage of parents of white SWD responded to the survey compared to percentage of white SWD enrolled. A lower percentage of parents of black and Hispanic SWD responded to the survey as compared to black and Hispanic SWD enrolled. Although a Spanish version of the survey was available both online and paper format, it is clear that increased efforts must be made to publicize the availability of the survey to all families. The data is being further analyzed, by region and LEA to determine why a lower percentage of parents of black students participated in the survey. The GADOE conducts webinars, provides training at the annual Data Conference and Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE), and provides information in weekly Email Blasts to special education directors and Georgia Parent Mentor Partnership parent mentors regarding the survey and ideas for increasing participation.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? Yes

Submitted survey: [GA Parent Survey FFY16](#)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline and targets for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.50%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 2

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	205	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

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

The State defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) Alternate Risk Ratio ≥ 3.0 for two consecutive years (FFY 2015, ≥ 3.0 and FFY 2016, ≥ 3.0) and (2) SWD Subgroup ≥ 15 .

Georgia has a minimum cell size of 15 for Students with Disabilities. Two(2) districts did not meet this cell size.

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

Georgia did not identify any LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from inappropriate identification.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will 7/2/2018

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	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%	3.98%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	11.27%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 2

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
46	17	205	11.27%	0%	8.29%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

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

Georgia identifies LEAs as having disproportionate representation by first examining the data. Any LEA that has a Risk Ratio of ≥ 3.0 for 2 consecutive years for a specific disability category in any racial/ethnic group is considered to have disproportionate representation. The State uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes.

Districts whose data reveals that they have disproportionate representation must review their policies, practice and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate policies, practices or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation (noncompliance). If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 17 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. These districts developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GADOE staff.

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Georgia has a minimum n size of 15. Two (2) districts did not meet the minimum cell size for at least one racial/ethnic subgroup; therefore, 205 districts were considered. Georgia has developed a Special Education Dashboard, which enables districts to view their data and understand how their alternate risk ratio is calculated.

Georgia defines disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Hispanic, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races) in special education and related services by using the following criteria: (1) Alternate Risk Ratio ≥ 3.0 for two consecutive years {FFY 2015, ≥ 3.0 and FFY 2016, ≥ 3.0 } and (2) SWD Subgroup ≥ 15 (minimum cell size).

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

Georgia uses a Comprehensive Compliance Review to review local policies, procedures, and practices to ultimately determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of noncompliant practices. The Comprehensive Compliance Review addresses the following areas: pre-referral interventions, child find, evaluation and eligibility determination processes.

Districts identified as having disproportionate representation must review their policies, practices and procedures and the Division for Special Education ultimately determines if inappropriate polices, practices or procedures contributed to the disproportionate representation. If determined to have noncompliance, the district is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan within 45 days of the determination and demonstrate timely correction of the noncompliance no later than one year from the notification. Using this process, 17 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of non-compliant policies. These districts developed a Corrective Action Plan and received ongoing technical assistance from GADOE staff.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
23	19	4	0

FFY 2015 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 2015, 23 districts were identified as having disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. All 23 districts received written notification of noncompliance with specific provisions of the Part B regulations by June 30, 2016. Nineteen districts corrected the noncompliance within one year of written notification and 4 districts 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. The State verified correction of noncompliance for all districts. The State: (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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the 17 districts identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 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 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	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%	98.42%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
33,294	32,814	98.80%	100%	98.56%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	480
---	-----

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 480 students were not completed within 60 days. This number represented 1.44% of all eligibility determinations in FFY2016.

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

- 231 eligibility determinations were completed 1-10 days after 60 days (48.1%).
- 127 eligibility determinations were completed 11-30 days after 60 days (26.5%).
- 68 eligibility determinations were completed 31-60 days after 60 days (14.2%).
- 54 eligibility determinations were completed 60+ days after 60 days (11.3%).

Districts completed 98.56% of evaluations in a timely manner in FFY 2016. The analysis of the 1.44% of the evaluations that were delayed included the following reasons:

- student delays (excessive absences, withdrawal and re-enrollment) (2.5%)
- parent delays (canceling meetings, not providing relevant information in a timely manner) (27.9%)
- teacher/evaluator delays (teachers not following through, lack psychologists, diagnosticians, or speech-language pathologists) (53.5%)
- district errors (no tracking system in place, errors in tracking, errors in policies and procedures) (7.1%); and
- other reasons (9.0%)

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

LEAs maintain a log of initial referrals to special education and completion dates. A spreadsheet is provided for LEA use which tracks the number of referrals completed on time, eligibility determination of the referrals (eligible or not eligible), if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. Special Education Directors submit these data by July 31st each year for the previous fiscal year. The data are submitted in the Timelines Application in the Special Education Dashboard. The target is 100% completed on time to be in compliance.

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.

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

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August.

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

The GA DOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. If selected, Directors are to upload child specific data for the students who they reported with completed evaluations/eligibility determinations the previous year. For example, if an LEA reported 892 evaluations/eligibility determinations completed, the director uploads a spreadsheet with the names, consent date, completion date, and accompanying demographic data showing evidence that those 892 referrals were completed in a timely manner. GA DOE staff may then check these data against what the LEA reported in the Student Record data collection.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
395	395	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia requires that each LEA submit Child Find timeline data by July 31st each year. LEAs reporting data that reveal that some evaluations/eligibilities were not completed within 60 days are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year.

Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities completed between July 1 and October 31 must be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November. GA DOE staff reviews the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely evaluation. Technical assistance is provided by GADOE staff to LEAs to ensure compliance.

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

LEAs with findings of noncompliance are required to participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities. Prong 1 addresses individual cases of noncompliance.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	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%	99.21%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	99.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,206
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	747
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,288
d. Number of children 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.	143
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	12
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	3,288	3,304	99.75%	100%	99.52%

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, or f	16
--	----

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

A total of 3,288 young children transitioning from Part C to Part B were determined eligible and had IEPs prior to their third birthday; however, 16 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 delays, teacher/evaluator delays, hearing and vision screening problems, and evaluation delays.

The number and percentage of students affected is outlined below

- 1-10 days delayed: 8 students (50.0%)
- 11-30 days delayed: 4 students (25.0%)
- 31-60 days delayed: 3 students (18.8%)
- More than 60 days delayed: 1 student (6.3%)

99.52% of the eligibilities received consideration prior to the child's third birthday. The analysis of the .48% that were delayed included the following reasons:

- Parent delay: 3 (18.8%)
- Teacher/evaluator delay: 8 (50.0%)
- Other reasons: 5 (31.2%)

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

LEAs maintain a log of children transitioning from Part C to Part B and dates that an eligibility determination was made and IEP in place. A spreadsheet is provided for LEA use which tracks the number of referrals, the number of children who have an IEP developed and in place by the 3rd birthday, if late, the number of days late and the reasons late. Special Education Directors submit these data by July 31st each year for the previous fiscal year. The data are submitted in the Timelines Application in the Special Education Dashboard. The target is 100% completed on time to be in compliance.

The State reviewed the Early Childhood Transition data of each school district to ensure that for each consent, the IEP was in place by the child's 3rd birthday for those young children who were eligible for services. Each district submitted a timeline report by July 31. Based on 09-02 OSEP Memo, Georgia identified noncompliance for this area.

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

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August.

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

The GADOE also conducts a Verification process for randomly selected LEAs each year. If selected, Directors are to upload child specific data for the students who they reported with completed evaluations/eligibility/IEPs the previous year. For example, if an LEA reported 150 evaluations/eligibility/IEPs for young children transitioning from Part C to Part B completed, the director uploads a spreadsheet with the names, consent date, completion date, and accompanying demographic data showing evidence that those 150 referrals were completed in a timely manner. GADOE staff may then check these data against what the LEA reported in the Student Record data collection.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia requires that each LEA submit Early Childhood Transition timeline data by July 31st each year. LEAs reporting data that reveal that some young children referred to special education from Part C and found eligible, did not have an IEP in place by the 3rd birthday are considered noncompliant and must participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 to demonstrate that they understand and implement regulatory requirements.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance and implementation of regulatory requirements. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late and the date that the evaluation/eligibility determination and IEP were completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year.

Prong 2 requires Special Education Directors to submit current year timeline data to demonstrate systemic compliance. Data regarding evaluations/eligibilities and IEPs four young children referred from Part C completed between July 1 and October 31 must be submitted through the Dashboard Timeline Application in November each year. GA DOE staff reviews the data submitted to determine whether the LEA has policies, practices, and procedures in place to ensure timely transition from Part C to Part B. Technical assistance is provided by GADOE staff to LEAs to ensure compliance.

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

LEAs with findings on noncompliance were required to participate in Prong 1 and Prong 2 activities. Prong 1 addresses individual cases of noncompliance.

Prong 1 requires Special Education Directors to provide a brief narrative about the policies, practices, and procedures that were revised to support the correction of the non-compliance. This narrative is submitted in the Timelines application in the Special Education Dashboard. Also, Special Education Directors are required to submit the list of students' names reported as late (IEP held beyond the 3rd birthday) and the date that the evaluation/eligibility and IEP was completed. This addresses the isolated findings of non-compliance. These activities are to be completed by the end of August each year.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					85.80%	5.50%	31.50%	60.10%	94.50%	94.98%	97.16%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.40%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4,018	4,055	98.40%	100%	99.09%

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.

All districts were required to complete the Transition Planning Survey. The surveys were completed via the Transition Planning Survey application in the GaDOE Portal, which collects the data for this indicator. The State required local school districts to conduct an initial review to determine compliance of randomly selected individual student transition plans (5 to 50 students contingent upon district size). The initial review was conducted between November 2016 and December 2016. An electronic date stamp verified successful timely transmission. Surveys not completed by the assigned due date adversely affects the district's timely and accurate determination.

An IEP, that included the Transition Service Plan and related components, was considered compliant if all components of the survey were reported as Y (Yes) or NA (Not Applicable, if allowable). Any component reported as N (No) represented noncompliance and the "All Areas in Compliance" section was reported as No.

Next, the State required districts to upload Individual Student Transition Plans to the GaDOE portal application during a ten-day period in January 2017. Districts uploaded 1 – 5 plans depending on their size. In addition, any plan that the district reported as non-compliant in any area was also uploaded to the State. An electronic date stamp verified successful timely transmission. State Special Education Division personnel and state designees were trained to identify noncompliance in transition plans. A rating procedure was developed and was consistent with the expectation for the local district.

The State Special Education Division personnel and designees reviewed the individual student transition plans to verify the compliance. Each of the 10 survey components for each plan 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.

All districts identified as having noncompliance were notified and directed to subsequently correct the noncompliance. Districts with non-compliant plans were required to correct the areas of non-compliance and upload additional plans for review by State Special Education Division personnel.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

Did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? Yes No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
49	49	null	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Georgia conducts a Transition Planning Survey to determine compliance for Secondary Transition. Each LEA is required to self-review select transition plans for students 16 and above. The GADOE randomly selects 10 – 50 names of students based on the size of the LEA. The review is submitted in the Transition Planning Survey in the Special Education Dashboard. The GADOE then reviews 10% of the plans submitted to determine compliance. If a plan is found to be noncompliant the Special Education Director is personally contacted by phone by the GADOE Transition Specialist. In addition to the conversation discussing the issues, a rubric is shared describing the area(s) of non-compliance. Technical assistance is also provided to the Special Education Director and/or staff by regional Transition Coaches. In isolated instances, the Transition Coach made personal visits to an LEA to provide training. The LEAs were required to re-submit the plans that were not compliant. All re-submitted plans were in compliance; had plans remained noncompliant the LEA would have moved to a Corrective Action Plan. All LEAs have multiple opportunities for professional learning regarding Transition Planning for students with disabilities. The GADOE offers training at the annual Data Conference, the Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education (GCASE), and to teachers at the annual Institute Designed for Education ALL Students (IDEAS) conference.

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

The Transition Planning Survey process requires that LEAs submit students' transition plans for review by GADOE personnel. The LEA director is personally contacted to discuss the area(s) of non-compliance. Technical assistance is provided by regional Transition Coaches. Each noncompliant plan is re-submitted to ensure that all areas are in compliance. If the GADOE finds continued noncompliance, the LEA is required to move to a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). No LEAs were placed on a CAP for Transition Planning in FFY2106.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 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 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							28.00%	28.00%	28.00%	24.80%	24.80%
		Data						27.23%	26.90%	24.70%	24.80%	24.78%	24.39%
B	2009	Target ≥							53.00%	53.50%	53.50%	53.60%	53.60%
		Data						51.46%	52.80%	52.50%	51.00%	53.64%	53.73%
C	2009	Target ≥							79.00%	80.00%	80.00%	79.90%	79.90%
		Data						77.08%	76.80%	76.30%	77.60%	79.95%	81.04%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	25.50%
	Data	26.00%
B	Target ≥	53.70%
	Data	56.07%
C	Target ≥	80.00%
	Data	78.46%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	26.25%	27.00%	27.40%
Target B ≥	53.70%	53.90%	54.00%
Target C ≥	80.00%	80.10%	80.10%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	10306.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	2659.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	3396.00
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)	1007.00
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).	1480.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

		who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	2659.00	10306.00	26.00%	26.25%	25.80%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	6055.00	10306.00	56.07%	53.70%	58.75%
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)	8542.00	10306.00	78.46%	80.00%	82.88%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? No

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

See the attached analysis of Indicator 14 response data.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥			88.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	62.70%	62.70%
Data		88.00%	47.00%	50.00%	41.20%	52.50%	25.00%	49.00%	48.00%	62.71%	62.90%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	62.80%
Data	64.55%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	62.90%	63.00%	63.10%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division for Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	48	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	83	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
48	83	64.55%	62.90%	57.83%

Reasons for Slippage

Georgia experienced a decrease in the number of resolution meetings held in the 2016-2017 school year. A fewer number of these resolution meetings were successfully resolved resulting in a smaller percentage. The confidential nature of the resolution process makes it difficult to accurately analyze why some resolution meetings were successful and others were not. The GADOE is not privy to the confidential discussions between districts and families. The data do indicate that fewer resolution meetings are held.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥			66.00%	60.00%	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%	60.71%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	60.00%
Data	48.53%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the State's performance on the APR Indicators and the targets. In August 2017, November 2017 and January 2018, the State Advisory Panel (SAP) was presented with the results of Georgia's performance on the APR indicators by the Division of Special Education personnel. SAP members were given the opportunity to discuss the SPP/APR Indicator data and activities and provide the State Special Education Director with feedback for improving outcomes, as well as, revising the SPP/APR. Other stakeholders, such as Local Education Agency (LEA) Directors of Special Education were given the opportunity to discuss APR indicator data and provide feedback regarding outcomes and targets. Additionally, the Division of Special Education annually posts results and provides a forum for discussion of state and local performance on each indicator.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	10	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	39	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	90	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
10	39	90	48.53%	50.00% - 70.00%	54.44%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2015	2016
Target ≥		41.00%		
Data	39.46%			

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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: Zelphine Smith-Dixon

Title: State Director

Email: zsmith@doe.k12.ga.us

Phone: 404-987-1568