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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

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

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

76

**General Supervision System**

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

Overview:   
The Florida Department of Education (FDOE), Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, Dispute Resolution and Monitoring section, assumes primary responsibility for the exceptional student education (ESE) monitoring and dispute resolution functions for the state’s 76 local educational agencies (LEA).   
  
Monitoring System   
The bureau implements a leveled (tiered) system of compliance monitoring. All LEAs participate in an annual desktop monitoring for compliance process that is verified by the bureau. Some LEASs participate in on-site monitoring and technical assistance visits based, in part, on data gathered through this process.   
  
Desktop Monitoring for compliance (Levels 1 and 2)   
The desktop monitoring process comprises both basic (Level 1) and focused (Level 2) components to ensure that LEAs comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and state statutes and rules, while focusing on student outcomes. The bureau has developed Web-based compliance protocols to align with selected indicators using the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements document. The specific standards (i.e., regulatory requirements) OSEP determined to relate most directly to each priority area and indicator under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as well as Florida-specific statutes and rules, are incorporated into the protocols, which include the citations for each standard.   
Desktop monitoring is the process where LEAs review critical components of their ESE programs. LEAs are responsible for completing the protocols and for identifying and reporting on required corrective actions. Information from these protocols is submitted to the bureau via the ESE General Supervision Website (GSW). Corrective action plans and correction of noncompliance findings are also reported and tracked via this website.   
  
On-Site Monitoring and Technical Assistance (Level 3) The purposes of the on-site monitoring and technical assistance process include the following:   
1. Monitoring the performance of students with disabilities and support LEAs in their efforts to improve results that ensure all students with disabilities graduate college and career ready by reducing barriers to equity and access.   
2. Monitoring compliance with related IDEA regulations and corresponding state rules to include state statutory requirements related to the use of restraint and seclusion.   
  
Criteria for Selection of LEAs  
Those indicators include:   
1. Identification as an LEA that is required to set aside 15 percent of the IDEA, Part B funds for comprehensive early intervening services based on data reflecting significant disproportionality in the categories of discipline, over-identification, or placement.  
2. LEA performance regarding   
 Percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a standard high school diploma   
 Percentage of students with individual educational plans (IEPs) dropping out of high school   
 Rates of suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs   
 Percentage of students with IEPs served in the regular education environment   
 Postsecondary outcomes for students with IEPs   
3. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification   
4. Reported incidents of restraint or seclusion for students with IEPs  
  
Dispute Resolution   
The responsibilities and activities of the Dispute Resolution and Monitoring section also include the following: coordination of the review and approval of LEA policies and procedures related to students with disabilities, provision of technical assistance and support to districts related to compliance with federal regulations and state laws related to the education of students with disabilities, facilitation of informal resolution at the local level, provision of state-sponsored mediation, provision of state-sponsored facilitated IEP process, and investigation of formal state complaints and oversight of the IDEA related due process hearing system. On a daily basis, bureau staff respond to parent calls and written correspondence regarding concerns related to the education of children with disabilities and facilitate communication between the parents and the LEAs. Information and resources are also provided to parents and LEAs to assist in the resolution of the issues. When the issues cannot be resolved informally at the local level, parents may request state-sponsored mediation or facilitated IEP team meetings, file a formal state complaint or request a due process hearing.  
  
Facilitated IEP Team Meetings  
Training is provided to IEP participants in all LEAs regarding the facilitated IEP process. LEAs are supported through the discretionary projects to offer facilitation at the district level. Facilitation requests are also received and processed by bureau staff for state-sponsored facilitators. State-sponsored facilitators are provided at no cost to the parents or the LEA.  
  
Mediation  
Mediation requests are received and processed by bureau staff with contracted mediators. State-sponsored mediation is provided at no cost to the parents or the LEA. Formal complaints are investigated by bureau staff who offer mediation and early resolution to the complainants and the LEAs as an alternative remedy. If both parties agree to mediation and the extension of the complaint, the complaint investigation is placed in abeyance pending the outcome of the mediation process (which usually takes place within two weeks of the request). If both parties agree to early resolution, the complainant and the LEA attempt to reach an agreement regarding the issues of the formal complaint. If an agreement is reached, the parties execute a legally binding agreement that sets forth the resolution and is signed by both parties. The written, signed mediation agreement is enforceable in state or U.S. LEA court.   
  
State Complaint  
For formal complaints that proceed to full investigation, both parties are provided an opportunity to submit documentation regarding the complainant’s allegations and the LEA’s response. Following FDOE's review of documentation and other inquiry activities which may include telephone interviews, records reviews or on-site visits, a report is issued within 60 days of the full filing per federal law with findings of fact, conclusions, reasons for the decision and recommendations, required actions or corrective actions, as appropriate. A due process hearing may be requested in addition to a request for mediation or the filing of a formal complaint. If all three are requested, the mediation occurs first (if both parties agree to mediate). If the complaint issues are the same as the issues to be addressed in the due process hearing, the complaint inquiry is placed in abeyance pending the outcome of the due process hearing. If there are issues in the complaint that are not a part of the due process hearing, investigation of these issues may proceed during the time that the due process hearing is pending. Complaint issues that are not addressed in due process may be investigated following the completion of the due process hearing.   
  
Due Process Hearings  
Due process hearing requests are submitted by parents to the local education agency (LEA), and forwarded by the LEA to the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH),the agency that conducts the hearings. Administrative law judges (ALJs), who are employed by DOAH and provided training by the FDOE, make determinations regarding the cases and provide information to the bureau. FDOE maintains the records following completion of the cases and provides oversight for the system (i.e. timelines, review of orders and training of ALJs). Data related to the corrective actions identified through complaints and due process are maintained by the bureau.  
   
Additional information is on the bureau’s website at http://fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/dispute-resolution.

**Technical Assistance System**

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

The bureau has developed and currently implements a comprehensive, overarching framework for effectively supporting LEAs based on evidence of need. Implementing this framework requires ongoing, continuous improvement effort using the systematic change process over time. The bureau works directly with LEA leadership to impact change at the school level. The ultimate indicators of success are student levels of performance targeted by the SPP and improved rates of compliance. The primary student population is general education students who have been identified as students with disabilities entitling them to additional supports and services in accordance with the IDEA.   
  
History  
In 2012, it was established that the desired outcome of our systemic effort was to provide a model of multi-tiered support to LEAs. This integrated system of supports, services, skills and resources is evidenced by:   
 An established universal screening system for determining tiered levels of support to LEAs based on need   
 A dynamic method (organizational structure that enables the flexible distribution of bureau resources based on specific need) for responding to those needs with integrated tools, products and   
 resources for building capacity to support successful outcomes for students   
 An annual increase in LEAs’ knowledge, skills, practices and satisfaction with bureau support Current System  
As is expected of LEAs, the bureau uses a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) as the framework for planning bureau support to LEAs and allocating resources to meet the student performance goals, in accordance with the FDOE and the bureau strategic plans and LEA-identified needs. A structured, problem-solving process is applied to address systemic and specific issues impacting educational outcomes of students with disabilities articulated in strategic goals. The work of bureau teams is organized around an MTSS, and the bureau provides a continuum of supports (technical assistance, training, resources, evidence-based practices, technology and policies) to LEAs in order to improve student achievement.   
  
The bureau currently offers a continuum of supports to LEAs designed to improve education for students with disabilities as evidenced by increased performance on SPP indicators and increased rates of compliance. The following list of examples conveys the current universal, supplemental and intensive supports provided by the bureau, which is updated based on evaluation of effectiveness over time.   
  
Universal Supports - General, statewide support designed to inform, assist and improve results for all LEAs:   
 The bureau, MTSS and Student Support Services websites   
 Special Programs and Procedures structure   
 Technical assistance papers   
Publications and professional development   
 Web-available resources via discretionary projects   
 ESE compliance manual   
 Various bureau-hosted presentations (e.g. Administrators' Management Meeting [AMM], and the Council of Administrators of Special Education [CASE])   
 Discretionary project administration (e.g. liaisons, project tracking system [PTS], calls and meetings)   
 Professional development portal Statewide IEP system with facilitated IEP training   
 LEA profiles   
 Family and community engagement efforts (e.g. brochures, videos, and Family Café) https://familycafe.net/videos/   
 Level 1 desktop monitoring (basic protocols)   
 ESE General Supervision Website (GSW) https://beessgsw.org/#/spp/institution/public/  
 LEA size-alike and/or issue-alike problem-solving groups   
 Technical assistance through directors’ conference calls and topical calls for LEA supervisors   
 Collaboration with state department on various initiatives   
  
Supplemental Supports - More focused, targeted, frequent support in addition to and aligned with universal supports that are provided to subgroups of LEAs in response to identified needs:   
 Targeted assistance in specific indicators from bureau indicator teams   
 Targeted size-alike and/or issue-alike problem-solving groups   
 Targeted attention and assistance from discretionary projects (by LEA/school request)   
 Daily, quick-response correspondence with families, LEAs, school and organizations through phone calls and emails   
 Level 2 desktop monitoring (i.e. specific and focused protocols)   
 GSW for voluntary LEA use   
 Various bureau presentations in response to a reported need (e.g. Institute for Small and Rural LEAs, Working with the Experts, and other discretionary projects)  
 Informal conflict resolution between LEAs and families  
 Program-area staff specialization and regular LEA-contact calls  
  
Intensive Supports - Most focused, targeted, frequent support in addition to and aligned with universal supports that are provided to individual LEAs in response to identified needs:   
 Individualized, targeted assistance (e.g., specific indicator support from bureau indicator teams)   
 Individualized, targeted attention and assistance from discretionary projects   
 GSW for target LEAs  
 Level 3 on-site monitoring visits and required corrective actions   
 Formal mediation between LEAs and families   
 State complaint procedures, including required corrective actions

**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.**

The State has mechanisms in place to ensure timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based professional development and support to LEAs. This mechanism is based on the needs of LEAs and managed through the five-year bureau strategic plan. Each strategic plan team focuses on specific needs and provides in-person and online professional development through bureau staff, discretionary projects and other professionals. The following are examples of professional development that was provided by discretionary projects related to best practices for inclusion:   
 Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE) Building Inclusive Schools   
 Disability Awareness Differentiating Instruction Universal Design for Learning   
 Accessible Instructional Materials   
 Access to the General Curriculum   
 Accommodations and Modifications   
 Inclusive Practices for the Developmentally Appropriate Pre-K Classroom   
 Leadership for Inclusion of Students with Disabilities   
For best practices for literacy and STEM (science, technology, engineering and math):  
Access Points/Essential Understandings   
Differentiating Reading Instruction, Differentiating Math Instruction, Differentiating Science Instruction   
Specially Designed Instruction and Interventions   
Working with the Experts for Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, Working with the Experts for Speech and Language   
Accommodations for Students with Visual Impairments   
Using Assistive Technology   
Strategic Instruction Model, Assessment   
Technology for Student Success: Tools for Reading Comprehension  
  
For best practices related to positive behavior and student engagement:   
Positive Behavior Support   
The ABS's of Behavior   
Positive Alternatives to Restraint, Seclusion and Suspension/Expulsion   
Trauma Informed Care   
Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement and Participation (CHAMPS)   
Crisis Prevention Institute   
Behavior Remediation Strategies   
Restorative Practices   
Behavior Management for Paraprofessionals   
Youth Mental Health First Aid (Train the Trainer)   
  
For best practices related to graduation and transition:   
Graduation Requirements Check and Connect Mentor Training   
Dynamic Dropout Prevention   
Using an Early Warning System to Increase Graduation Success of Students with Disabilities   
Developing Interagency Transition Teams   
Using Transition Assessment Data to Write Measurable Postsecondary Goals   
Discovery Process for Students in Transition   
Building Work Skills for Employment Success: Strategies and Resources   
Introduction to Secondary Transition Planning for Students with Disabilities   
Self Determination and Self Advocacy   
Supporting Graduation and Attendance in Juvenile Justice Programs   
  
Discretionary projects provided professional development to support prekindergarten program effectiveness, program quality, inclusion, evaluation and assessment, curriculum and instruction, transition, child outcome measurement and family involvement, as well as Child Find awareness and outreach.   
  
Discretionary projects also provided training to meet LEA needs pertaining to parent involvement. These trainings were designed to promote effective parent participation in the education of children who are exceptional or have special needs. In addition, over 86 sessions in the areas of Advocacy, Assistive Technology, Birth to Five, Disaster Preparedness, Employment, and Mental Health were provided to 310,900 Facebook viewers and 42,900 YouTube viewers. These are listed at https://www.familycafe.net/publications.   
  
Since 2013, the bureau has worked collaboratively with Key2Ed and the discretionary project, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System, to provide professional development regarding the facilitated IEP process to all LEAs. The purpose of this training is to provide LEA staff with the skills needed to facilitate IEP meetings that result in productive collaboration between parents and school staff.   
  
  
Bureau staff and other professionals provided professional development through bi-monthly Topical Calls, ESE Director’s Calls, and facilitated calls in lieu of the annual Administrators Management Meeting (AMM), which was postponed in 2020 due to COVID-19. Specific professional development sessions provided included:   
   
Using Data Well  
Discipline of Students with Disabilities  
Collaboration for Effective Educator Development Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR)   
Roadmap Action Planning   
Peers as Partners in Learning  
State Complaints for Students in DJJ/County Jails  
Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS)  
Florida Postsecondary Comprehensive Transition Programs  
Multi-Tiered System of Support  
ESSA  
Mental Health Plans  
Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and Placement Under the IDEA

**Stakeholder Involvement**

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

The development of Florida’s SPP is the responsibility of strategic plan teams. Each team includes individuals with expertise pertinent to the indicator which includes  
staff from the FDOE, staff from discretionary projects funded by the FDOE (including LEA-level and school-level representation) and individuals from other agencies.   
Florida’s State Advisory Committee has also been a critical stakeholder group for the development of the SPP and the APR. A draft of the initial targets was provided to this group in 2020 and input was taken at their biannual meeting. Those recommendations were also shared with the bureau strategic plan teams, and revisions to the targets were made, as necessary. The advisory committee continues to meet and provide input for revisions, as necessary, each year. Most recently, the committee met virtually on December 3, 2020. The majority of committee members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.   
  
In addition, the committee has representatives that include teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities, representatives of other state agencies involved in financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities, representatives of private schools and public charter schools, a representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care, and representatives from the state juvenile and adult corrections agencies.

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

NO

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

Within 120 days following Florida's submission of the APR, LEA Performance Reports will be produced and posted on the FDOE website. The LEA Performance Reports are intended to be used as a tool for planning for systemic improvement in exceptional education programs. The profiles contain a series of data indicators that describe measures of educational benefit, educational environment, prevalence and parent involvement for each LEA in the state. Also included in the APR is information about state-level targets from Florida's SPP/APR, LEA performance on the indicators and whether the LEA met each of the state's targets. The State publicly reports on the Bureau’s website on the FFY 2018 (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/. The reports are under the heading of SEA/LEA Profiles and LEA Performance Reports.  
SEA/LEA Profiles and LEA Performance Reports  
(Note: the LEA Performance Reports are the last two pages of the Profiles.)  
  
A copy of the complete SEA SPP/APR can be found at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/spp-apr-letters. A link is also available from the bureau's data page; https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/.   
  
Historical assessment participation and proficiency are posted online as well for years when assessments are administered at https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/. Assessment participation and proficiency are also available via FDOE's Business Intelligence and Reporting Tool; Florida PK-20 Education Information Portal (EdStats) at https://edstats.fldoe.org/.   
.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

For the State Systemic Improvement Plan, the Florida Department of Education (FDOE), in collaboration with its internal and external stakeholders, identified the measurable result of increasing the statewide graduation rate for students with disabilities from 52.3% (2012-13 graduates) to 62.3% (2017-18 graduates), an increase of at least 2% per year, and closing the graduation gap (baseline 23.2 percentage points in 2012-13) for students with disabilities by half (to 11.6 percentage points). The State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) is related to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) results Indicator #1: Percentage of youth with individual educational plans graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. §1416(b)). As the 2% per year was exceeded , the 2018-19 target was set at 70%, which represents an increase of 7.7 percentage points. In 2018-19, the graduation rate for students with disabilities was 80.6%, which exceeded the target of 70%, and closed the graduation gap for students with disabilities to 6.3 percentage points, which exceeded the initial target of 11.6 percentage points.  
  
The focus of the SSIP implementation is building Florida’s SEA’s capacity to support LEAs with the implementation of evidence based practices (EBPs) that will lead to measurable improvement in the SIMR for students with disabilities. To support the LEA’s implementation of the coherent improvement strategies, the SEA has provided a continuum of supports (e.g., technical assistance, training, resources, EBPs, technology and policies) to LEAs, schools and families. The Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (bureau) provides this support with a multi-tiered, data-based approach. As a result, some LEAs receive more intensive, focused support.  
  
All measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State’s last SSIP submission will be reported in the FFY2019 SPP/APR SSIP report submitted on or before April 1, 2021. The State will be utilizing the SSIP template provided by OSEP to capture the summary and data that demonstrates implementation activities that support and impact the State’s capacity to continuously increase the SiMR data.

## Intro - OSEP Response

OSEP issued a monitoring report to the State on December 18, 2020 and is currently reviewing the State’s response submitted on March 17, 2021 and will respond under separate cover.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 44.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 54.30% | 56.30% | 58.30% | 60.30% | 62.30% |
| Data | 55.06% | 56.80% | 61.55% | 66.00% | 77.41% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 70.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team, both of which were formed and are supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to transition indicators, including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance and postschool outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout rate and postschool outcomes are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, and each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.   
In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of bureau staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the members of SSTIC included representatives from the following partner organizations:   
• Agency for Persons with Disabilities  
• Family Network on Disabilities  
• Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology (FAAST)  
• Florida College System  
• Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities  
• Florida Center Students with Unique Abilities (FCSUA)  
• Florida Department of Children and Families  
• Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach  
• Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Division of Blind Services  
• FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education  
• FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
• FDOE Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention  
• Florida Department of Transportation  
• Florida Developmental Disabilities Council  
• Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)  
Florida Youth Council  
• Institute for Small and Rural Districts  
• Learning Disabilities Association of Florida  
• Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)  
• Project 10: Transition Education Network  
• State University System  
• The Able Trust  
  
The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team included representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:  
• Agency for Persons with Disabilities  
• Florida College System  
• FDOE of Dropout Prevention  
• FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education  
• FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
• Florida Developmental Disabilities Council  
• Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)  
• FDLRS  
• Resource Materials and Technology Center: Deaf/Hard of Hearing (RMTC-DHH)  
• SEDNET  
• Project 10: Transition Education Network  
• State University System  
This team examined appropriate data very closely, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity and primary exceptionality as they developed the strategic plan. The target for Indicator 1 was set based on the annual graduation rate target under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | \*[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 22,936 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 81%[[2]](#footnote-3) |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*1 | 22,936 | 77.41% | 70.00% | 81%2 | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

As outlined in Section 1003.4282, Florida Statutes, to earn a standard diploma in Florida for the cohort of students who graduated in 2019 include the following course, credit and assessment requirements as follows:   
Four credits in English/English language arts (ELA). A student must pass the statewide, standardized Grade 10 Reading assessment, or earn a concordant score, in order to graduate with a standard high school diploma.   
Four credits in mathematics, which must include Algebra 1 and Geometry. The statewide, standardized Algebra1 end-of-course (EOC) assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade. A student must pass the Algebra 1 end-of-course (EOC) assessment or earn a concordant score for graduation with a standard high school diploma. A student who earns an industry certification for which there is a statewide college credit articulation agreement approved by the State Board of Education may substitute the certification for one mathematics credit. Substitution may occur for up to two mathematics credits, except for Algebra 1 and Geometry.   
Three credits in science, two of which must have a laboratory component. A student who takes Biology 1 must take the statewide, standardized Biology 1 EOC assessment. The Biology 1 EOC assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade. A student who earns an industry certification for which there is a statewide college credit articulation agreement approved by the State Board of Education, may substitute the certification for one science credit, except for Biology 1.   
Three credits in social studies of which one credit in World History, one credit in United States History, one-half credit in United States Government and one-half credit in economics are required. A student who takes United States History must take the statewide, standardized United States History EOC assessment; the student's performance on the assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade.   
One credit in fine or performing arts, speech and debate, or practical arts.   
One credit in physical education.   
Eight credits in electives.   
Students may also earn a standard high school diploma using an 18-credit-hour option, which includes all of the above, except physical education is not required, and requires three electives instead of eight.   
A waiver of standardized assessment results may be granted by the IEP team, to a student with a disability, as provided by Section 1008.22(3)(c), Florida Statutes. . For a student To be considered for a statewide, standardized assessment results waiver, the following criteria must be met: 1. The student must be identified as a student with a disability, as defined in s. 1007.02, F.S.: The term “student with a disability” means a student who is documented as having an intellectual disability; a hearing impairment, including deafness; a speech or language impairment; a visual impairment, including blindness; an emotional or behavioral disability; an orthopedic or other health impairment; an autism spectrum disorder; a traumatic brain injury; or a specific learning disability, including, but not limited to, dyslexia, dyscalculia, or developmental aphasia. 2. The student must have an individual educational plan (IEP). 3. The student must have taken the statewide, standardized assessment with appropriate allowable accommodations at least once. 4. In accordance with s. 1008.22(3)(c)2., F.S., the IEP team must make a determination of whether a statewide, standardized assessment accurately measures the student’s abilities, taking into consideration all allowable accommodations for students with disabilities. The waiver does not change the standards or requirements a student with a disability has to meet in order to graduate. The waiver is only to be utilized by students with disabilities with extenuating circumstances that is determined by the IEP team when granted and is not used by the majority of students with disabilities in the state.

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

YES

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

Students with disabilities must meet the same requirements as all students to graduate, though for students with disabilities who have taken the statewide standardized assessment with allowable accommodations at least once and not earned the required score necessary for graduation, results of the assessment may be waived. A waiver of standardized assessment results may be granted by the IEP team, to a student with a disability, as provided by Section 1008.22(3)(c), Florida Statutes. For a student To be considered for a statewide, standardized assessment results waiver, the following criteria must be met: 1. The student must be identified as a student with a disability, as defined in s. 1007.02, F.S.: The term “student with a disability” means a student who is documented as having an intellectual disability; a hearing impairment, including deafness; a speech or language impairment; a visual impairment, including blindness; an emotional or behavioral disability; an orthopedic or other health impairment; an autism spectrum disorder; a traumatic brain injury; or a specific learning disability, including, but not limited to, dyslexia, dyscalculia, or developmental aphasia. 2. The student must have an individual educational plan (IEP). 3. The student must have taken the statewide, standardized assessment with appropriate allowable accommodations at least once. 4. In accordance with s. 1008.22(3)(c)2., F.S., the IEP team must make a determination of whether a statewide, standardized assessment accurately measures the student’s abilities, taking into consideration all allowable accommodations for students with disabilities.

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

All Florida students work to receive a standard diploma. Students with disabilities must meet the same requirements for graduation, though may access a waiver for statewide standardized assessment, though this is an IEP team consideration and decision. The waiver is not changing the standard that all students have to follow in taking the statewide assessments; it is utilized by a limited number of students with disabilities with extenuating circumstances who meet requirements for consideration that the IEP team considers when granting waivers.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 20.35% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 16.80% | 15.10% | 13.40% | 11.70% | 10.00% |
| Data | 19.25% | 18.72% | 17.33% | 15.86% | 12.98% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 9.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team, both of which were formed and are supported by the bureau.   
Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to transition indicators,   
including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance and postschool outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout rate and postschool outcomes are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, and each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.   
In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of bureau staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the members of SSTIC included representatives from the following partner organizations:   
• Agency for Persons with Disabilities  
• Family Network on Disabilities  
• Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology (FAAST)  
• Florida College System  
• Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities  
• Florida Center Students with Unique Abilities (FCSUA)  
• Florida Department of Children and Families  
• Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach  
• Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Division of Blind Services  
• FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education  
• FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
• FDOE Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention  
• Florida Department of Transportation  
• Florida Developmental Disabilities Council  
• Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)  
Florida Youth Council  
• Institute for Small and Rural Districts  
• Learning Disabilities Association of Florida  
• Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)  
• Project 10: Transition Education Network  
• State University System  
• The Able Trust  
The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team included representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:  
• Agency for Persons with Disabilities  
• Florida College System  
• FDOE of Dropout Prevention  
• FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education  
• FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
• Florida Developmental Disabilities Council  
• Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)  
• FDLRS  
• Resource Materials and Technology Center: Deaf/Hard of Hearing (RMTC-DHH)  
• SEDNET  
• Project 10: Transition Education Network  
• State University System  
This team examined appropriate data very closely, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity and primary exceptionality as they developed the strategic plan. The target for Indicator 1 was set based on the annual graduation rate target under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

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

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 21,748 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 1,107 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 2,510 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 91 |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,510 | 25,456 | 12.98% | 9.50% | 9.86% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

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

Below are the exit codes and definitions for a dropout as provided in our SEA database manuals. All LEAs submit these codes electronically into Florida's Student Information System:  
DNE: Any student expected to attend a school but did not enter as expected for unknown reasons and required documented efforts to locate the student are  
maintained per s. 1003.26, Florida Statutes.  
W05: Any student age 16 or older who leaves school voluntarily with no intention of returning and has filed a formal declaration of intent to terminate school  
enrollment per s. 1003.21, Florida Statutes.  
W13: Any student withdrawn from school due to court action. (Does not apply to DJJ students).  
W15: Any student withdrawn from school due to nonattendance after all procedures outlined in sections 1003.26 and 1003.27, Florida Statutes, have been followed.  
W18: Any student withdrawn from school due to medical reasons and is unable to receive educational services, such as those provided through the hospital/homebound program.  
W21: Any student withdrawn from school due to being expelled with no educational services.  
W22: Any student whose whereabouts is unknown and required documented efforts to locate the student are maintained per s.1003.26, Florida Statutes.  
W23: Any student withdrawn from school for any other reason than those listed above.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

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

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

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

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 94.00% | Actual | 93.60% | 94.73% | 95.20% | 94.98% | 96.00% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2005 | Target >= | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% | 99.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 94.00% | Actual | 95.02% | 95.04% | 95.54% | 95.80% | 96.36% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 99.00% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 99.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Representation from the Florida Department of Education participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Just Read, Florida!, the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services and the Office of Early Learning  
Representation from the Florida Department of Education discretionary projects participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Problem Solving/Response to Intervention, Problem Solving/Response to Intervention: Technology and Learning Connections, Regional Educational Laboratories, Resource Materials and Technology Center for the Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Learning Ally, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System  
  
Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Standards and Instructional Supports and the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System, State Personnel Development Grant Strategic Instruction Model, school district Local Educational agency representatives; are all on the math strategic advisement team.  
  
Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Florida Inclusion Network, Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention-Technology & Learning Connections, and Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System are all on the Access-Best Practice for Standards-Based Instructional Support advisement team.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

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

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 96.00% | 99.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 96.36% | 99.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

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

As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included math and reading assessments.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

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

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2014 | Target >= | 51.00% | 51.00% | 56.00% | 61.00% | 66.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 24.91% | Actual | 24.91% | 18.52% | 23.98% | 24.59% | 26.02% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Overall | 2014 | Target >= | 51.00% | 51.00% | 56.00% | 61.00% | 66.00% |
| **A** | Overall | 29.43% | Actual | 29.43% | 24.30% | 29.50% | 30.29% | 32.07% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Overall | 66.50% |
| Math | A >= | Overall | 66.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Representation from the Florida Department of Education participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Just Read, Florida!, the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services and the Office of Early Learning  
Representation from the Florida Department of Education discretionary projects participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Problem Solving/Response to Intervention, Problem Solving/Response to Intervention: Technology and Learning Connections, Regional Educational Laboratories, Resource Materials and Technology Center for the Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Learning Ally, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System  
  
Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Standards and Instructional Supports and the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System, State Personnel Development Grant Strategic Instruction Model, school district Local Educational agency representatives; are all on the math strategic advisement team.  
  
Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Florida Inclusion Network, Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention-Technology & Learning Connections, and Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System are all on the Access-Best Practice for Standards-Based Instructional Support advisement team.

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

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

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 26.02% | 66.50% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Overall |  |  | 32.07% | 66.50% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

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

**Public Reporting Information**

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

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

As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included math and reading assessments.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 19.40% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 9.00% | 7.00% | 4.00% | 2.00% | 5.00% |
| Data | 11.63% | 11.11% | 9.30% | 7.69% | 11.90% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 4.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

33

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 4 | 43 | 11.90% | 4.00% | 9.30% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

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

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Significant discrepancy for indicator 4A is defined as a rate ratio of three or higher when comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities within the local educational agency. Districts are excluded from the calculation when they have fewer than 10 students with disabilities who are suspended/expelled for more than 10 days.  
  
Numerator = rate for students with disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of all students with disabilities) x 100.   
  
Denominator = rate for students without disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (all students without disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of all non-disabled students) x 100.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) reviews suspension and expulsion data for each of its districts and identifies those districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions by comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities each school year. The policies, procedures, and practices involved with and governing suspension and expulsions for students in the identified districts are reviewed, analyzed, and assessed annually to ascertain what factors have contributed to the discrepancies. Through reviews and analyses, FDOE offers technical support and guidance for strategies and interventions through a multi-tiered approach to address the disproportionality. The FDOE reviews all districts’ policies and procedures related to discipline annually. Based on FDOE’s review, districts are provided technical assistance to update their policies and procedures if out of compliance.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

45

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 17 | 0 | 31 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Significant discrepancy for indicator 4B is defined as a rate ratio of three or higher for a specific racial/ethnic group when comparing student with disabilities to students without disabilities within the local educational agency. Districts included in the calculation consist of every race that meets the n-size, which is more than 10 days.  
  
Numerator = rate for students with disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (for instance, Hispanic students who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment for all Hispanic students with disabilities) x 100.   
  
Denominator = rate for students without disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (for instance, all students without disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment for all non-disabled students) x 100.   
  
There was a total 76 districts. There were 45 districts excluded because they did not meet the minimum n-size. Therefore, 31 districts were included in the calculation.

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) reviews suspension and expulsion data for each of its districts and identifies those districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions race and ethnicity each school year. The policies, procedures, and practices involved with and governing suspension and expulsions for students in the identified districts are reviewed, analyzed, and assessed annually to ascertain what factors have contributed to the discrepancies. Through reviews and analyses, FDOE offers technical support and guidance for strategies and interventions through a multi-tiered approach to address the disproportionality. The FDOE reviews all districts’ policies and procedures related to discipline annually. Based on FDOE’s review, districts are provided technical assistance to update their policies and procedures if out of compliance.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

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

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

In the narrative describing its methodology, the State reports "[d]istricts included in the calculation consist of every race that meets the n-size, which is more than 10 days." OSEP notes that "more than 10 days" is not an "n" size.

## 4B- Required Actions

The State must clarify, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the methodology used to determine which districts are included in the calculation for this indicator.

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 77.00% | 79.00% | 82.00% | 83.00% | 85.00% |
| A | 54.40% | Data | 74.44% | 73.02% | 73.90% | 75.27% | 76.20% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 10.00% | 9.00% | 8.00% | 7.00% | 6.00% |
| B | 23.20% | Data | 12.91% | 13.91% | 13.77% | 13.79% | 13.52% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 2.00% | 1.75% | 1.50% | 1.25% | 1.00% |
| C | 3.00% | Data | 3.92% | 3.84% | 3.79% | 3.26% | 3.38% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 85.00% |
| Target B <= | 6.00% |
| Target C <= | 1.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the bureau's "Best Practices for Inclusion" Strategic Planning Team, which was formed and is supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls.  
  
This team analyzed data regarding districts’ identified priorities on their required Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) self-assessment. Team members also reviewed state- and district-level data related to inclusion in relation to disability type, age, district and transitions from elementary to secondary settings.  
It is important to note that the indicators are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, as well as each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida’s multi-tiered system of supporting school districts.  
The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.  
  
The Best Practices for Inclusion Strategic Planning Team includes representation from the bureau and the following partner organizations:  
Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)  
• Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)  
• Resource Materials and Technology Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (RMTC-D/HH)  
• Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)  
• Center for Autism & Related Disabilities (CARD)  
• Project Access  
• Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Network (SEDNET)

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 377,535 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 285,955 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 49,758 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 8,936 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 657 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 2,437 |

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

YES

**Provide an explanation below**

Students in correction facilities and parentally-placed private schools are removed from this calculation. The denominator should be 372,692 and have been updated as such in the chart.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 285,955 | 372,692 | 76.20% | 85.00% | 76.73% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 49,758 | 372,692 | 13.52% | 6.00% | 13.35% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 12,030 | 372,692 | 3.38% | 1.00% | 3.23% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

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

Students in correction facilities and parentally-placed private schools are removed from this calculation. The denominator should be 372,692 and have been updated as such in the chart.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

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

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 33.00% | 38.00% | 43.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% |
| A | 29.76% | Data | 26.99% | 35.83% | 36.73% | 40.09% | 39.23% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 49.30% | 48.30% | 47.30% | 46.30% | 45.30% |
| B | 48.89% | Data | 51.18% | 49.54% | 49.82% | 48.54% | 46.90% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 50.50% |
| Target B <= | 44.80% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In addition to the stakeholder input explained in the introduction, input from other stakeholders for this indicator was also received from the Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team, a team formed and supported by the bureau. Input was gathered through both face-to-face meetings as well as conference calls.  
  
Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to educational environments in which children with disabilities ages 3 through 5 years are served. The team assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results. The Prekindergarten Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from the bureau, the following discretionary projects and partner organizations:  
  
• University of Miami, Measuring Outcomes  
• University of Central Florida, Technical Assistance and Training System  
• Florida Department Of Education (FDOE), Office of Early Learning  
• Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS), Child Find  
• University of South Florida, Student Support Services  
• Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)  
• Florida Department of Health (FDOH), Children's Medical Services, Early Steps  
• Access Project  
• Healthy Families Florida Ounce of Prevention

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 42,980 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | 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 | 16,869 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 19,640 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 820 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 11 |

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

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 16,869 | 42,980 | 39.23% | 50.50% | 39.25% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 20,471 | 42,980 | 46.90% | 44.80% | 47.63% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 64.60% | 66.10% | 68.10% | 70.60% | 73.60% |
| A1 | 65.90% | Data | 64.92% | 66.66% | 69.12% | 71.25% | 74.46% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 82.90% | 83.40% | 83.90% | 84.40% | 84.90% |
| A2 | 75.80% | Data | 80.42% | 81.10% | 81.60% | 80.42% | 77.64% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 64.90% | 66.40% | 68.40% | 70.90% | 73.90% |
| B1 | 58.80% | Data | 61.93% | 63.16% | 65.02% | 65.32% | 66.55% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 69.90% | 71.40% | 73.40% | 75.90% | 78.90% |
| B2 | 52.90% | Data | 66.46% | 66.49% | 67.22% | 66.38% | 64.63% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 56.40% | 57.90% | 59.90% | 62.40% | 65.40% |
| C1 | 59.50% | Data | 55.63% | 56.84% | 61.42% | 64.11% | 65.69% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 80.00% | 80.50% | 81.00% | 81.50% | 82.00% |
| C2 | 73.30% | Data | 77.05% | 77.22% | 78.42% | 78.14% | 76.91% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 75.10% |
| Target A2 >= | 85.40% |
| Target B1 >= | 74.40% |
| Target B2 >= | 79.40% |
| Target C1 >= | 67.40% |
| Target C2 >= | 82.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Representation from the Florida Department of Education 619 Coordinator; Florida Department of Education discretionary project, Technical Assistance & Training System; Florida Department of Education, Office of Early Learning; Florida Department of Education, discretionary project Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System; Florida Department of Education discretionary project Florida Inclusion Network; Florida Headstart representative; Florida Department of Health, Early Steps State office and Local offices; school district Local Educational agency representatives; educators from the early learning community; University consultants; data consultants are all on the Child Outcomes advisement team.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

1,554

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 43 | 2.77% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 214 | 13.77% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 213 | 13.71% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 572 | 36.81% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 512 | 32.95% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 785 | 1,042 | 74.46% | 75.10% | 75.34% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,084 | 1,554 | 77.64% | 85.40% | 69.76% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 52 | 3.35% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 456 | 29.34% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 241 | 15.51% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 527 | 33.91% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 278 | 17.89% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 768 | 1,276 | 66.55% | 74.40% | 60.19% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 805 | 1,554 | 64.63% | 79.40% | 51.80% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 49 | 3.15% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 283 | 18.21% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 161 | 10.36% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 445 | 28.64% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 616 | 39.64% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 606 | 938 | 65.69% | 67.40% | 64.61% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 1,061 | 1,554 | 76.91% | 82.50% | 68.28% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | The cause for the slippage can be attributed to the absence of exit assessments due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments. In 2018-19, 11,581 children participated in exit assessments, compared to 1,554 in 2019-20. |
| **B1** | The cause for the slippage is attributed to the absence of exit assessments due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments. In 2018-19, 11,581 children participated in exit assessments, compared to 1,554 in 2019-20. Florida’s preschool discretionary projects will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs. |
| **B2** | The initial analysis suggests a single cause for the slippage being attributed to the absence of exit assessments due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments. In 2018-19, 11,581 children participated in exit assessments, compared to 1,554 in 2019-20. Florida’s preschool discretionary projects will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs. |
| **C1** | The cause for the slippage can be attributed to the absence of exit assessments due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments. In 2018-19, 11,581 children participated in exit assessments, compared to 1,554 in 2019-20. |
| **C2** | The cause for the slippage can be attributed to the absence of exit assessments due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments. In 2018-19, 11,581 children participated in exit assessments, compared to 1,554 in 2019-20. |

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

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

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

NO

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

The criteria used for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" was a standard score of 78 or above, that is, >-1.5 SD. The instrument used was the Battelle Development Inventory, Second Edition. The procedure used to gather the data was individual administration of the BDI-2 when children entered the prekindergarten program and when they exited the program. Only children who participated in the program for at least 6 months were included. Use of the BDI-2 Screening Test instead of the full assessment was permissible under specific circumstances for using the BDI-2 Screening Test described in the state's Child Outcomes Measurement System guidance documents.

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

The Battelle Developmental Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI-2) is used to assess children on program entry and program exit. Data from assessments conducted by  
PreK personnel (or, for some entry assessments, obtained from a partnering Local Early Steps program) are entered into the BDI-2 Data Manager, a proprietary  
online scoring system. The data are downloaded from the Data Manager and analyzed through a discretionary project funded by the FDOE. Students' scores  
from the Personal-Social domain are used to address Outcome A; scores from the Communication domain are used to address Outcome B; and scores from  
the Adaptive domain are used to address Outcome C.

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

As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments. In 2018-19, 11,581 children participated in exit assessments, compared to 1,554 in 2019-20. Florida’s preschool discretionary project will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs.  
  
As directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments for PreK. In conjunction with the Executive Order, Florida closed all school campuses in response to the guidance provided by the President and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) social distancing guidelines, therefore, exit assessments, which are conducted in person, that had not occurred prior to school campus closures and the Declaration of the Executive Order, were not completed for the remainder of the 2019-2020 school year. Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) did not have a virtual option available to Florida at that time.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the data for this indicator. Specifically, the State reported, "[a]s directed by the Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-01, districts were instructed to cancel all remaining state assessments for the 2019-20 school year, which included the exit assessments. In 2018-19, 11,581 children participated in exit assessments, compared to 1,554 in 2019-20. Florida’s preschool discretionary project will continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs both regionally and by district based on identified needs."

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

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

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

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement Strategic Planning Team, which was formed and supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to parent involvement and engagement, including the percentage of parents who report that schools partnered with them. The team assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results.   
  
The Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from the bureau and from the following department areas and partner organizations:   
• Florida Department of Education, Independent Education and Parental Choice  
• Family Network on Disabilities- OSEP’s federally funded parent center  
• Florida Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS)  
• Piedra Data Systems  
• State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)  
• Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach  
• Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources Center (FDLRS)  
• Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)  
• Project 10: Transition Education Network  
• University of Miami’s Exceptional Student Education Parent Survey Project  
• Parents of students with disabilities  
• Parents of the Panhandle Information Network (POPIN) - Federally funded parent training and information center  
• Parent Education Network- Federally funded parent training and information center  
Bureau staff members and school district personnel all provided input, including staff from the following partner organizations, discretionary projects and advisory committees:  
• The State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students  
• State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee  
• The Family Café  
• Parent to Parent (of Miami) - Federally funded parent training and information center  
• Florida Developmental Disability Council

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Preschool | 2008 | Target >= | 76.00% | 80.00% | 83.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| Preschool | 43.00% | Data | 72.18% | 73.02% | 73.33% | 73.33% | 83.24% |
| School age | 2008 | Target >= | 76.00% | 80.00% | 83.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| School age | 32.00% | Data | 74.31% | 77.05% | 77.73% | 77.74% | 80.05% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 85.00% |
| Target B >= | 85.00% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately**

| **Group** | **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 3,336 | 4,047 | 83.24% | 85.00% | 82.43% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| School age | 28,127 | 34,452 | 80.05% | 85.00% | 81.64% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

414,166

**Percentage of respondent parents**

9.30%

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | YES |

**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.**

Florida invites all parents of students receiving special education services to contribute their perceptions of schools’ efforts to promote their involvement. Florida has vastly increased the number of parents who have participated in the annual Indicator 8 survey. This year’s total of 38,499 respondents includes substantial representation of all racial/ethnic groups, grade levels, and categories of exceptionality. The state has determined that parent responses are representative of the demographics of the children receiving special education services.  
  
Due to Florida’s diverse and mixed populations, the Florida Department of Education is committed to offering the opportunity for all parents and guardians to provide feedback to represent all diversities of our state’s students with disabilities. Each year during pre-survey planning, data containing the native language spoken in the student’s home is compiled. Surveys are then translated and provided to meet parent/student needs based on these demographics. Currently the survey is available in English, Spanish, Haitian Creole, Russian, and Mandarin Chinese. Other languages are made available upon request. At the survey’s end, demographic data from all submitted surveys is analyzed to determine the extent to which the demographics of the submitted surveys compares to state demographic data specific to student’s receiving special education services as well as all students.

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

The State reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. However, in its narrative, the State did not include an analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative.

## 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 75 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

YES

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

Florida defines "disproportionate representation" as a rate ratio of 3.0 or higher using the Westats risk ratio method for calculating disproportionate representation. The minimum cell size is 10 and minimum "n" size is 30. Only one year of data is used for this calculation.

**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.**

The process for determining whether disproportionate representation of a particular racial or ethnic group is the result of inappropriate identification includes analysis of the district's risk index in comparison to the state risk index for that group; patterns and trends in the risk index and rate ratio over time to identify patterns and progress in addressing disproportionate representation; review of policies and procedures (SP&P) document submitted to the FDOE electronically; and, the results of On-site and Desk-top monitoring of all districts identified with disproportionate representation.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 6 | 0 | 75 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

YES

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

Florida defines "disproportionate representation" as a rate ratio of 3.0 or higher for a single year using the Westats risk ratio method. The state has established a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum "n" size of 30 in calculating the risk ratio when determining disproportionate representation.

**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.**

The process for determining whether disproportionate representation of a particular racial or ethnic group is the result of inappropriate identification includes analysis of the district's risk index in comparison to the state risk index for that group; patterns and trends in the risk index and rate ratio over time to identify patterns and progress in addressing disproportionate representation; review of policies and procedures (SP&P) document submitted to the FDOE electronically; and, the results of On-site and Desk-top monitoring of all districts identified with disproportionate representation.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 92.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.10% | 97.05% | 96.84% | 97.81% | 97.39% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 51,452 | 49,100 | 97.39% | 100% | 95.43% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

The primary reason for the 2.06% slippage in completing evaluations within the 60-day evaluation timeline was due to pandemic-related restrictions and obstacles when it came to conducting psycho-educational evaluations. A combination of assessment instrument demands (many designed only for face-to-face use), evaluator proficiency and competence (most trained only to conduct comprehensive evaluations in face-to-face settings), and the general health precautions and social distancing practices of families prevented the traditional and validated approach to conducting timely psycho-educational assessments. Secondary reasons that could have also contributed to the slippage pertain to the declining numbers of practicing school psychologists in the State (16 less in FFY 2020), the very large school psychologist to student ratio (1:1892 – almost four times the ratio recommended by the National Association of School Psychologists) and the added mental health related duties currently in demand by all school districts around the State (direct and indirect services, including conducting threat assessments and suicide risk assessments).

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

2,352

**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.**

There was a total of 2352 initial ESE evaluations completed beyond the 60-day timeline.  
  
1-10 calendar days beyond = 606  
11-20 calendar days beyond = 356  
21+ calendar days beyond = 942  
21+ calendar days beyond & evaluations pending = 448  
  
The reasons for the delays listed above are the same as stated the section explaining the 'reasons for slippage:' The primary reason for not completing evaluations within the 60-day evaluation timeline was due to pandemic-related restrictions and obstacles when it came to conducting psycho-educational evaluations. A combination of assessment instrument demands (many designed only for face-to-face use), evaluator proficiency and competence (most trained only to conduct comprehensive evaluations in face-to-face settings), and the general health precautions and social distancing practices of families prevented the traditional and validated approach to conducting timely psycho-educational assessments. Secondary reasons that could have also contributed to the slippage pertain to the declining numbers of practicing school psychologists in the State (16 less in FFY 2020), the very large school psychologist to student ratio (1:1892 – almost four times the ratio recommended by the National Association of School Psychologists) and the added mental health related duties currently in demand by all school districts around the State (direct and indirect services, including conducting threat assessments and suicide risk assessments)

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

Initial evaluations must be completed within 60-calendar days after the school district receives parental consent for an evaluation. Calendar days excluded from the count are – summer vacation, school holidays, Thanksgiving Break, Winter Break, Spring Break, student absences beyond the 8th day, and calendar days when schools were physically closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The department developed a web-based application, IDEA Indicator 11 Data, which is accessed through the Department of Education Single Sign On platform. Districts enter the number of parental consents obtained and the number of evaluations completed within and beyond the evaluation time frame. The application auto-calculates totals and percentage of evaluations completed with the 60-day timeline. When the number of consents and completed evaluations does not match, the district must provide a brief explanation for each student and the anticipated completion date in a pop-up dialogue box.

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

The Florida Department of Education Executive Order 2020-EO-1 (related to COVID-19) and pandemic-related restrictions and obstacles, impacted the completion of evaluations within the 60-day evaluation timeline when it came to conducting psycho-educational evaluations. A combination of assessment instrument demands (many designed only for face-to-face use), evaluator proficiency and competence (most trained only to conduct comprehensive evaluations in face-to-face settings), and the general health precautions and social distancing practices of families prevented the traditional and validated approach to conducting timely psycho-educational assessments. The bureau extended the reporting deadline to assist districts in reporting timely and accurate data.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 37 | 37 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State's process for verifying that noncompliant districts are currently implementing the regulatory timeline requirements necessary to achieve 100% compliance involves randomly sampling initial evaluations and using those results to verifying their current corrective effort. To be more specific, with the aim of achieving the expectation set by 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1), each of the systemic noncompliant districts that were identified as noncompliant in FFY 2018 had their 2019-20 (FFY 2019) evaluation caseload randomly sampled, beginning in the month of July and continuing until the sample of a given month demonstrated 100% compliance, thus confirming their current level of performance and compliance consistent with the regulatory requirements. Each of the targeted districts generated compliant FFY 2019 sample sets, verifying their correct implementation of the 34 CFR 300.301(c)(1) regulatory requirement.

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

The State verified correction of each individual case of noncompliance for FFY 2018 by requiring the noncomplying districts to (1) submit the evaluation completion date for each student whose assessment was incomplete at the time of the State’s Indicator 11 data submission or (2) explain why the evaluation of record is to be exempt from the dataset (e.g., student left the district’s jurisdiction prior to completion of the evaluation). Each of the tracked cases now have evaluation completion dates or have their exemptions explained, thus correcting all documented individual noncompliance cases for FFY 2018.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 32.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.90% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 7,901 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 244 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 6,622 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 549 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 486 |
| 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. |  |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 6,622 | 6,622 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

0

**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.**

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State monitoring

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

Using survey 5 (all year enrollment) and survey 2 (October enrollment) from the student information database obtained from FDOE’s Education Information and Accountability Services office, FDOE matches the data file from FDOH Early Steps with survey 5 data files. Once survey 2 is available, the FDOE repeats the matching process. Finally, FDOE  
unduplicates all matching records. FDOE sends districts the resulting data sets for review and data verification. Specifically, districts are asked to verify the child’s enrollment in the district, dates of eligibility determination, eligibility status and IEP dates. Districts must code records for all children who are not located in the FDOE student information  
database or do not have eligibility of the IEP dates on or before their third birthday.  
  
Upon completion of the data review and verification process, districts return the final data sets to FDOE for processing. FDOE uses the final data sets to  
calculate Indicator 12(a), (b), (c), (d), and (e). It calculates a final compliance percentage using the following formula: [c ÷ (a - b - d - e)] × 100.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 82.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 90.55% | 90.38% | 94.84% | 90.40% | 95.64% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 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 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 572 | 578 | 95.64% | 100% | 98.96% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

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

State monitoring

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

BEESS/FDOE implements a statewide monitoring self-assessment system, which includes Indicator 13. A sampling plan identifies the number of student   
records to be reviewed, as well as any criteria that must be applied when selecting student records. The bureau staff validates the accuracy of data obtained from   
the districts' self-assessments through a desk review of student records.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | NO |

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

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

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State provides training and technical assistance to assist LEAs to correctly implement the regulatory requirements. LEAs with noncompliance are required to submit corrective action plans and subsequent samples until they achieve a sample that demonstrated 100 percent compliance.

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

Each LEA with noncompliance was required to review and revise student-specific IEPs to demonstrate the correction of each individual case of noncompliance. These records were reviewed by the State and found to be compliant.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

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

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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

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

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

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

**II. *Data Reporting***

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

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 31.00% | 33.00% | 35.00% | 37.00% | 39.00% |
| A | 27.00% | Data | 28.63% | 28.48% | 27.84% | 24.30% | 25.58% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 44.00% | 46.00% | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% |
| B | 37.00% | Data | 43.67% | 43.18% | 43.84% | 50.55% | 55.03% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 57.00% | 60.00% | 63.00% | 66.00% | 69.00% |
| C | 50.00% | Data | 55.74% | 54.91% | 56.16% | 58.76% | 62.97% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 41.00% |
| Target B >= | 53.00% |
| Target C >= | 72.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team, both of which were formed and are supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to transition indicators, including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance and postschool outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout rate and postschool outcomes are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, and each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.   
  
In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of bureau staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the members of SSTIC included representatives from the following partner organizations:   
• Agency for Persons with Disabilities  
• Family Network on Disabilities  
• Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology (FAAST)  
• Florida College System  
• Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities  
• Florida Center Students with Unique Abilities (FCSUA)  
• Florida Department of Children and Families  
• Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach  
• Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Division of Blind Services  
• FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education  
• FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
• FDOE Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention  
• Florida Department of Transportation  
• Florida Developmental Disabilities Council  
• Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)  
 Florida Youth Council  
• Institute for Small and Rural Districts  
• Learning Disabilities Association of Florida  
• Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)  
• Project 10: Transition Education Network  
• State University System  
• The Able Trust  
The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team included representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:  
• Agency for Persons with Disabilities  
• Florida College System  
• FDOE of Dropout Prevention  
• FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education  
• FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation  
• Florida Developmental Disabilities Council  
• Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)  
• FDLRS  
• Resource Materials and Technology Center: Deaf/Hard of Hearing (RMTC-DHH)  
• SEDNET  
• Project 10: Transition Education Network  
• State University System

**FFY 2019 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 | 18,363 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 4,537 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 5,025 |
| 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) | 357 |
| 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). | 977 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 4,537 | 18,363 | 25.58% | 41.00% | 24.71% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 9,562 | 18,363 | 55.03% | 53.00% | 52.07% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 10,896 | 18,363 | 62.97% | 72.00% | 59.34% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B** | The cause for the .93% slippage can be attributed to economic impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic. . Review of data sources indicates a 2.96 percentage point decrease this year for students enrolled in higher education or competitively employed and similarly mirrors the decline in postsecondary enrollment and labor market trend data throughout the state and national level. Overall, the Florida College System FTE Enrollment decreased by over 1,500 students from the 2018-2019 to 2019-2020 school year, however State University System of Florida data indicates an increase of students by over 1,700 students. Florida's unemployment rate moved from a low of 2.8% in November 2019, to a high of 14.7% in April 2020 while this resulted in a slight drop in the data, the current economic outlook is on the upward trend in Florida. It is expected that districts will improve their results with the continued implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) including the provision of Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) and the continued implementation of the Perkins V Plan to increase the attainment of workforce credentials. Continued additional technical assistance along with additional production of guiding documents, will assist as well, ultimately improving outcomes for student. |
| **C** | The cause for the 12.66% slippage can be attributed to impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic. With the current economic outlook on an upward trend in Florida, it is expected that districts will improve their results with the continued implementation of the provision of Pre-ETS through continued implementation of WIOA, provided by districts and the continued implementation of the Perkins V Florida Plan; both will work to increase the attainment of workforce readiness, skills, and credentials for students, including students with disabilities throughout Florida. Continued additional technical assistance, along with additional production of guiding documents, will assist with improving outcomes for student. |

**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.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

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

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | NO |

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), established by Section 1008.39, Florida Statutes to provide follow-up data on all exiters of all public education or training programs in Florida, is used to search for all exiting students in postschool settings. FETPIP does not sample or use a survey procedure to collect these data. It is a data collection and consumer reporting system, using a technique referred to as "record linkage," a computerized process which combines individually identifiable data from several different administrative data bases. The purpose of the linkage is to develop aggregate statistics that describe the experiences of student groups or participants after exiting an education or training program. The aggregates are used to produce outcome performance measures that are intended to assist in evaluating the success of educational programs. More information about FETPIP may be found at http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/fl-edu-training-placement-info-program. As this robust data system looks for information on all students, not just a sampling, and is not predicated on surveying and survey responses, the data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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

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

With COVID-19, the impact to post-school outcomes indicated a decline in both enrollment in higher education or competitively employed and enrollment in higher education or in some other postsecondary

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 131 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 81 |

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The development of Florida's SPP is the responsibility of strategic plan teams that include staff from the FDOE, staff from discretionary projects funded by the FDOE (including district- and school-level representation) and from other agencies. Each team includes individuals with expertise pertinent to the indicator. Florida's State Advisory Committee has also been a critical stakeholder group for the development of the SPP and APR. A draft of the initial targets was provided to this group and input was taken. Those recommendations were also shared with the strategic plan teams, and revisions to the targets were made, if necessary. The advisory committee contains a majority of members who are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities. In addition, the committee has representatives that are appointed by the governor, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities, representatives of other state agencies involved in financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities, representatives of private schools and public charter schools, a representative from the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care, and representatives from the state juvenile and adult corrections agencies.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 57.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 72.50% | 73.00% | 74.00% | 74.50% | 75.00% |
| Data | 70.59% | 79.66% | 29.63% | 97.22% | 92.59% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 75.50% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 81 | 131 | 92.59% | 75.50% | 61.83% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The cause for the 13.67% slippage can be attributed to impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic. During the fourth quarter of the 2019-20 fiscal year, the State saw a sharp decrease in due process complaints filed and resolution meetings held and resolved successfully compared to the previous two quarters due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

During the fourth quarter of the 2019-2020 fiscal year, the State saw a sharp decrease in due process complaints filed and resolution meetings held and resolved successfully compared to the previous two quarters due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 39 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 3 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 28 |

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder input for Indicator 16 is identical to stakeholder input for Indicator 15. For Indicator 16, Dispute Resolution and Monitoring strategic plan team and stakeholder groups had direct input in choosing the targets.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 79.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 68.20% | 70.20% | 72.20% | 74.20% | 75.00% |
| Data | 55.56% | 60.53% | 66.67% | 72.00% | 69.05% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 75.50% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | 28 | 39 | 69.05% | 75.50% | 79.49% | Met Target | No Slippage |

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

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

The State’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) attachment was not embedded due to privacy protections.

# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Victoria Gaitanis

**Title:**

Bureau Chief, Exceptional Student Education

**Email:**

Victoria.Gaitanis@fldoe.org

**Phone:**

850-245-0941

**Submitted on:**

04/29/21 3:16:38 PM

# ED Attachments

  

1. Data suppressed due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection [↑](#footnote-ref-3)