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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**

During FFY 2021, the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) continued its steadfast commitment to providing quality public education to students across Puerto Rico (PR) despite incredibly challenging circumstances. In this Executive Summary, we provide significant events impacting the FFY 2021 reporting period and then proceed to provide an overview of the PRDE structure and organization.

The 2021-2022 school year marked the return to in-person learning since schools were initially shutdown in March 2020 in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. After initially being shut down effective March 14, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Puerto Rico schools operated virtually for essentially the entire 2020-2021 school year. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021, but unfortunately, Puerto Rico experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all PRDE schools were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021 and remained closed for in-person learning for the remainder of the 2020-2021 school year. As such, PRDE’s reopening of schools for the 2021-2022 school year was unique and PRDE dedicate significant resources preparing for the return to school.

With this context, the PRDE Associated Secretariat of Special Education (SAEE) presents this report for the FFY 21-22. A school year focused on 3 goals. First, that all students would receive in-person classes (‘presenciales’) in a secure matter, once this happened the DE could start with academic recovery. Second, strengthen the resources bank to increase the capacity to offer evaluation and therapy services. Third, modernize the infrastructure of the education system. With this in mind, the PRDE Secretary and all the secretariats and sub-secretaries outlined 6 areas of focus, presented in the document “Department of Education Strategic Plan.” The 6 areas are as follows: 1. Improve academic achievement, 2. Involve parents in a participatory way, 3. Empower Principals and Teachers, 4. Strengthen the technological infrastructure, 5. Maximize administrative quality, 6. Promote socioemotional health. Given this, the SAEE developed the "Strategic Plan of the Special Education Program from 2021 to 2026" the actions to be carried out to address 6 focus areas on the students with IEP.
Goal 1: Improve academic achievement for all students to achieve this goal, the Special Education Program included in its work plan the following initiatives:
Implementation of multisensory models that allow increasing the readiness of essential skills such as reading and writing.
1. Professional training academies for regular teachers on inclusive education and attention to diversity.
2. Strengthening the implementation of the STAR® curriculum at the elementary level and the Link® curriculum at the higher level; and expand the number of special classrooms using this curriculum.
3. Implementation of the work-based teaching model, better known as "Work Base Learning" in special classrooms starting at the upper level.
4. Initiatives aimed at increasing the number of educational and related service providers available in the Department and retaining them.
5. Development of essential curricular content for students participating in the modified and alternate study program, aligned to the regular program, but adapted to the level of functioning of the students and focused on the development of functional skills for life.
6. Strengthening of the implementation of the public policy of School Organization for the Special Education Program that allows the creation and improvement of appropriate placement alternatives.
7. Strengthening of the teaching process through the provision of equipment and materials necessary to implement the Individualized Educational Programs (IEP).

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

Within the work plan of the Department of Education under the “ESSER/COVID Relief” funds, the Associated Secretary for Special Education began with the second phase of the “Upgrade” to the Project of the Mi Portal Especial Information System (MiPE). PRDE takes this initiative with the mission of being able to provide users with a better experience when carrying out the processes of the special education program. Using new technology, users have a more agile platform with cutting-edge technology which can be accessed through multiple types of devices (Laptop, Desktop, Tablets or Mobile Devices). This version attended the recommendations from stakeholders to improve the platform so it can be more accessible to the users with virtual experience which was a need identified during the COVID Pandemic. Some of the new initiatives was the Parent Platform in which they can access the electronic record of their children, including evaluation, IEP, transportation services, assistance for the related services and is another way that they can file due process complaints. Also there is an integration with the electronic signature.

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

1

**General Supervision System:**

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

As stated in previous APRs the SAEE general supervision system includes many components and is carried out at all levels of the PRDE system. At the Central Level, the SAEE has a Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU), which is responsible for monitoring throughout the Commonwealth to ensure compliance with IDEA and Puerto Rico requirements. The MCU carries out monitoring activities of implementation of IDEA at the ORE and school levels. The MCU is responsible for issuing findings when noncompliance is identified as well as providing necessary follow-up to ensure findings of non-compliance are corrected in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification. PRDE SAEE carries out work at the regional level with significant support from its Special Education Service Centers (CSEEs, by its acronym in Spanish). The SAEE oversees eleven CSEEs. The CSEEs are located in Aguada, Arecibo, Bayamón, Caguas, Fajardo, Humacao, Mayagüez, Morovis, Ponce, San Germán, and San Juan. They operate as a link with PRDE's educational regions, with some regions having more than one CSEE based on specific needs. The CSEE’s were established to provide and assist students with disabilities and their parents with special education services. The services they provide include registration, parent consent to evaluation, initial evaluations (Indicator 11, eligibility determination processes, re-evaluations, and coordination of therapy services. The CSEEs are a key component of PRDE’s General Supervision System; they have the responsibility of ensuring compliance with Indicators 11 and 12 and ensuring services are provided in a timely manner. Another important main responsibility of the CSEEs is to serve as the liaison for children transitioning from Part C to B and their parents, including with regard to their referral from Part C, evaluation, and provision of services. During FFY 2015, the Government of Puerto Rico established an initiative to positively impact the timely transition from Part C to Part B. Under this initiative, staff from the Puerto Rico Department of Health who work on the Part C program are physically located on the same premises as Part B staff in order to aid in communication and collaboration with the transition process. The location in which the staff is located is called the Integrated Service Center (Centro de Servicios Integrados). The initiative started as a pilot project in the Caguas Region in November 2015. This pilot effort has been a great success, and parents have been pleased with this arrangement. It has helped improve the process and ensure a smooth transition from Part C to Part B services. The initiative expanded during the 2016-2017 school year to a second Service Center, which is Fajardo. During April 2016 OSEP visited the facilities in Caguas and Fajardo observing the benefits for parents with children with disabilities. During 2021-2022 SAEE continued with the same two Integrated CSEEs with great satisfaction and feedback from parents. The CSEEs have the Assistive Technology Advisory Committees (‘CAAT’ by its acronym in Spanish). This committee includes the professional experts who have the responsibility of providing the assistive technology evaluations. The PRDE Special Education Legal Division (SELD) is responsible for receiving and investigating State Complaints. When findings of noncompliance are identified through the investigation of a State Complaint, the SELD is charged with issuing the notification of finding as well as with providing the necessary follow-up to ensure findings of noncompliance are corrected in a timely manner. The PRDE Secretarial Unit (Remedio Provisional) is the unit charged with managing due process complaints. The Secretarial Unit's responsibilities include the hiring and training of hearing officers, and Mediators, as well as follow-up activities to ensure hearings are held and complaints fully adjudicated within a timely manner.

**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.**

PRDE SAEE has a Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) that is responsible for setting public policy on educational aspects. The TAU is comprised of individuals who work with the following areas: deaf, blind and deaf-blind, private schools (purchase of services), pre-school transition (619 Coordinator), post-secondary transition, Autism, adaptive physical education, assessment and assistive technology. Additionally, in the new PRDE organization the TAU personnel are assigned to support each of the 7 Regional Educational Office (ORE), with their individualized needs. In the DE organization, each ORE has a Special Education Facilitator in the Academic area with the Chief Academic Officer and in the Student Services Area a Superintendent of that area. The personnel from the TAU is the liaison for the ORE with the Special Education Central Level Office (SAEE) and are the key components who identify the need for the ORE and coordinate activities related to providing support and technical assistance to schools. Additionally, each TAU staff member is designated as the team member with special expertise in a specific subject matter(s) (e.g., adaptive physical education, secondary transition, blind or visually impaired students, pre-school children) for which that member is available to the rest of the TAU staff members to provide assistance. The TAU is also responsible of implementing the professional development and technical assistance work plan of the SAEE. The TA and professional development is on going during the school year and has the purpose of improving compliance and or indicator performance, making sure the special education personnel, community and facilitators, teachers and students aids professional development needs are identified and attended to including providing them with tools on how to manage their daily work plan. Throughout the 2021-2022 school year, the TAU provided TA and professional development to all level staff (central level, ORE and school level) on the program new policies and procedures.

Since 2018, Puerto Rico has been implementing PBIS in 612 elementary and middle schools around the island, which include K to 8th grade. We have implemented all three tiers of Trauma Informed PBIS, are currently focused on reviewing Tier 1 and Tier 2 via in person training with the PBIS teams, which include the School Director, School Psychologist, School Counselor, School Nurse, School Social Worker and 2 teachers. These efforts intend to help them contextualize the Multi-tiered implementation to the traumas experienced in the island (i.e., Hurricanes Irma, Maria, earthquakes and the pandemic), in order to decrease the need for specialized 1:1 interventions that drain school resources. For the first time, during this school year, we have been impacting 10-50 students referred by the PBIS team to participate from a socioemotional learning group that consists of 5 offerings. School personnel have been enthusiastic about this component and most schools have a waiting list in hopes it is included for next school year. Finally, PBIS teams will be participating from a regional-wide (i.e., district-wide in the States) PBIS closing at the end of the school year to share their triumphs, the challenges faced, and their creative problem solving.

As part of the TAU’s 2021-2022 work plan, and to ensure high quality support to the Educational Regions, CSEEs, teachers and schools, the SAEE developed three guides during FFY 21-22. The first, guide was developed to address the transition back to in-person classes, which included mechanisms to support personnel for the in person clases. The second is the Guide for Adaptive Physical Education to support teachers on determining the criteria for eligibility and establishes the evaluation committee which is key for the eligibility determination. The third is the Guide for Post-secondary Transition, which includes the post secondary transition protocols and the process to better serve students in the transition process (August 2021). On December 16, 2021, the TAU provided Professional guidance on the postsecondary transition assessment and planning process for schools and in January 20, 2022 provided guidance to facilitators and counselors on the Transition Guide from School to Adult Life.

**Professional Development System:**

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

PRDE has mechanisms in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively prov ide services that improve results for children with disabilities. The Technical Assistance Unit (discussed in the section immediately above) is one component of providing technical assistance to address skills of our service providers. Additionally, below we provide information regarding various initiatives PRDE undertook during FFY 2021 to this regard.

For the Blind Program during the 2021-2022 school year there were various professional development t activities. Training was provided for Teachers of Students with Visual Impairments by the American Printing House (APH) on the use of the Page Blaster, Assistive Technology equipment used by blind students, and writing and reading in Braille. With the support of APH around the island, we established 6 laboratories. The first was in the Humacao CSEE, then in San Juan within the University of Puerto Rico campus, Loaiza Cordero School (San Juan), Caguas CSEE, Arecibo CSEE and in the Lola Rodriguez de Tio school in San German. These laboratories provide space for teachers to reproduce materials in Braille. The blind congress took place in December 2021, with the purpose of teachers receiving support on the secondary transition process for blind students. An MOU with University of PR for the post- secondary transition of students with Cognitive Impairments- for the first time in PR the students participating in Alternate diploma and modified diploma (Route 2 and 3) the opportunity to enroll in the University of the State to peruse a Technical Certificate.

Certify school personnel with the Ana G. Mendez University, Institute for the Deaf Blind, in this certification were included; school psychologist, adaptive physical education teachers and teachers in deaf blindness. The personnel interested completed a google form and were selected those who impacted deaf or deaf blind students. This certification courses were 10 sessions of 5 hrs. each, that included: identification nature of the deafblind, sign language, orientation and mobility, transition and future planning for deafblind students and Parent acceptance process. Within these 50 hours, 2 classes are provided by a Maria Bove (specialist from Vermont) and she visits schools were we have deaf blind students and provides demonstrative classes to provide suggestions and tools to teaches. Also with this Institute, Central Level personnel has monthly meetings to discuss specific cases, how to improve processes and the Institutes progress. They provide support to teachers in the post-secondary transition or adulthood called the “future plan”. In PR October is the blindness month. On October 15th is the White Stick (baston blanco). In thi sregard the teachers has to develop activities of awareness and dissemination (divulgación). On December 13th which is the blind day, there was a virtual meeting with teachers and the PR National Federation President for the blind. She as a blind person discussed with teachers how her life testimony was impacted by teachers and how their service helped her overcome barriers.

By region, the deaf teachers have a teacher liaison and every two months Central Level has meetings with them to establish initiatives such as: the development of the Guide for services to deaf students, the development of a new screening instrument (done with an audiologist) to determine the level of vocabulary, reading and writing in sign language the student has. For the new deaf teachers, there were trainings regarding the standards for the goals and objectives of the expanded curriculum of IOWA, with the purpose of teachers having the resources to complete their IEPs. On September 2021 is the deaf campaign during this month Central Level SAEE provided trainings to parents as requested by the PR PTI. Follow up with teachers is done every other month for initiatives.

Also the TAU for alternate assessment made new blue prints, which allows access to students with the most significant cognitive impairments to regular curriculum.

The TAU provided training on the process of Alternate Assessment. For this process, the Department identifies at least 2 Coordinators by ORE (Regional Educational Office) to work with the logistics of the alternate assessment and provide training to the teachers that will provide this method of evaluation. These coordinators are trained intensively every year to assure the process is done correctly. Also during February 2018, Technical Assistance was provided by all the personnel from the TAU in each Region on Post-Secondary Transition which included information impacting APR Indicators B13 and B14. In March 2018, the TAU provided technical assistance to all the Special Education Facilitators. The themes covered were as follows: IEP and all of its components including measurable goals and objectives, placement (how to identify the correct placement for a student and how to develop new placements), and the process for extended school year.

During August 2021, PRDE’s Cumbre de Lideres Educativos (Education Leaders Summit) provided capacity building workshops for School Directors, facilitators, superintendents and Regional Directors including the CSEE Directors. The summit covered a variety of topics including: IEPs, how to establish the IEP calendar, transportation, development and provision of services, Federal and State compliance.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

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

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

6

**Parent Members Engagement:**

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

For the SAEE, parent engagement and involvement is extremely important. This is why, during FFY 2021-2022, the SAEE Secretary of Special Education conducted monthly meetings with various important parent organizations in PR that focus on students with special needs. The first group is the Comite Timon (Steering Committee). This is a special education parent advocacy committee. This group was established in 1996. The Comite Timon is made up of parents and community members and is the primary group of advocates for students with disabilities rights within the island. They provide advocacy, paralegal and legal orientation to parents for children with disabilities. In addition, they provide support for parents in the IEP meetings. Likewise, monthly meetings are held with the Autism Alliance (Alianza de Autismo.). This is also a parent advocacy and dissemination center but specifically for parents with children with Autism. This group helped develop in PR the “Ley BIDA”, to promote the early identification, diagnosis, and intervention for students with autism, and also to create a support group for the families and provide continuing education (educación continua) related to the health professionals who work with this population.

Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), is an organization to support parents of children with disabilities founded in 1977. APNI provides training and tools to parents in several areas such as: special education law and processes, IEP, adequate intervention for parents with children with ADH, Autism, behavior modification, prevention of bullying for children with disabilities, post-secondary transition, accommodations, discipline, communication, and conflict resolution. Every year APNI, with the SAEE support and collaboration, organizes a parent Congress with a specific topic of interest for parents. This year the selected topic was pre-school and post-secondary transition and it took place March 9-11, 2021. One of the key presenters was our Interim Secretary of Special Education. During 2021-2022, APNI impacted approximately 26,000 families and providers with orientations, respite services, advocacy, community learning, support for families impacted by the earthquakes, COVID 19 pandemic and hurricane Fiona. For this year, the SAEE has APNI parents serving as Coordinators to facilitate a smooth pre- school transition in each CSEE.

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

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

PRDE conducts a variety of activities to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. The SAEE within its Central Level structure has a Unit called “Services to students, parents and the community”. This Unit has the purpose of locating children with disabilities and the dissemination of information regarding the special education services (in public schools, private schools, University, government offices, community-based places, radio, TV, newspapers and medical facilities, and much more). It also helps and supports parents seeking orientation at the Central level offices and oversees personnel from the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish) located in the CSEEs who coordinate the pre-school transition. These parents are responsible to provide guidance to parents as soon as they arrive to the CSEEs seeking services for their children. This has proven to be effective in the way that parents feel more engaged, more knowledgeable, and accepted with peers that understand the process that they are going through. Their work helps increase the capacity of parents including in understanding the Part C to Part B transition process and provide feedback on improvement activities and related policies.

During FFY 2021, PRDE conducted a series of Parent Academies (Academia de Padres), where post-secondary transition topics were discussed. During these sessions, parents participate in capacity building sessions and also provide feedback regarding improvement activities and policies related to post-secondary transition. Additionally, various parents participated in technical assistance sessions provided by SAEE Technical Assistance Unit personnel in collaboration with NTACT:C, including a session in April 2022 that covered post-secondary goals, objectives, and activities to work with students with severe disabilities.

As a part of its SSIP efforts, PRDE SAEE has worked with parents on SSIP implementation and capacity building for these parents on a variety of topics connected to the SSIP. PRDE has created communities of learning in which workshops are provided for parents on topics such as how to support student learning at home. During these sessions, parents provide input and recommendations regarding the SSIP and implementation thereof.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

As discussed above, PRDE holds monthly meetings with its stakeholder groups. As meetings are held throughout the year, input is received on APR matters including setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

The APR is developed in consultation with the stakeholder group, including target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation. The draft APR is reviewed with the stakeholder group and feedback and recommendations are incorporated prior to final submission by the February 1, 2023 deadline. The stakeholder committee is apprised of the clarifications process and consulted as necessary. PRDE publishes copies of its SPP/APR on its website as noted below.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.**

PRDE has all of its APR published on its web site at: https://de.pr.gov/cumplimiento/

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

PRDE's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In PRDE's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised PRDE of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required PRDE to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed PRDE to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. PRDE must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

During FFY 2021 and since the issuance of OSEP's determinations on June 23, 2022, PRDE SAEE has received technical assistance from a variety of outside sources, such as multiple USDE-funded technical assistance centers, and took various actions as a result of the technical assistance. Technical assistance sources through which PRDE received assistance include the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), and the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTAC:C).

PRDE SAEE received technical assistance from NCSI in a variety of ways. PRDE SAEE continued participating in the NCSI Math Collaborative, which is positively impacting PRDE's SSIP activities and supports all States, with the same topic, to help and collaborate through our struggles in the implementation of the SSIP. PRDE’s participation in the NCSI Math Collaborative has helped PRDE consider and think through new ideas that it has been able to incorporate into its SSIP efforts. For example, through the collaborative, NCSI provided tools and resources regarding engagement of school directors through a variety of strategies including the use and sharing of data. PRDE has used this idea in expanding the use and sharing of data with its SSIP schools’ school directors.

In April 2022, PRDE participated in the Chicago NCSI: Evidenced Base Practices: Spring in Person Cross State Learning Convening. In the convening, the team from the PRDE SAEE built relationships with peers from across states to share, discuss, and network to support collaborative Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs). As well, we discussed considerations for the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) to facilitate equity among students and support for districts. Likewise, we identified ways to build consistency within the SEA in order to successfully use and expand MTSS at all stages. We received feedback on strategies and solutions to overcome the barriers to implement the SSIP.

In addition to the collaborative, NCSI has provided technical assistance to PRDE in variety of additional ways. NCSI supported PRDE SAEE in resolving concerns raised by the Region 3 Comprehensive Center related to implementation of the Modified School Diploma and the alternate assessment. With NCSI’s support, PRDE SAEE was able to successfully communicate with the other provider in a way that allayed their concerns. NCSI support has also been of great help to PRDE in other areas such as fiscal, PBIS, RTI, and others. The technical assistance received has been of great value to PRDE SAEE in making decisions related to its SSIP implementation, and particularly regarding PRDE's approach to evaluation of the SSIP effort.

Another technical assistance source through which PRDE has received assistance is IDC. We took advantage of the opportunity for the IDC to review and provide feedback to drafts of Indicators for our FFY 2021 APR. They made comments that were taken into consideration in the preparation of this APR. As well, we participated in virtual TA sessions with IDC such as the SSIP Data Quality Peer Group Drop-In, which was a great opportunity for States to benefit from the discussion and reminders from TA providers on requirements for the submission of this SSIP, and the SPP/APR Data Quality Peer Group Drop-In, which was a great resource for us while in the middle of the development of the APR to benefit from other States’ concerns and questions and clarifications. Additionally, IDC has assisted PRDE in reviewing data reporting submissions and has provided important and helpful feedback that allowed PRDE to make decisions regarding the preparation and submission of reports.

PRDE has received technical assistance from NTACT:C with regard to post-secondary transition and outcomes. PRDE has worked closely with NTAC:C in the development of a State Transition Plan. This is an action work plan for PRDDE to improve the post-secondary transition services delivery across the island for students with IEPs. One important result of this work is that 69 PRDE teachers have been certified on Planning and Evaluation on post-secondary transition. Similarly, with NCTAC:C support, PRDE counselors were able to take courses that allowed them to obtain certification on evaluation of post-secondary and career interests. This allows them to provide career and vocational evaluation services for students. A total of 19 counselors completed the certification program. The main NTACT:C resource that has been supporting PR SAEE is Catherine Fowler, PhD, Co-Director of the NTACT:C.

PRDE has appreciated the support and wealth of resources of the technical assistance; the results and outcomes of our work with the technical assistance providers have been invaluable.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The Puerto Rico Department of Education's (PRDE) determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the PRDE that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the PRDE received assistance; and (2) the actions the PRDE took as a result of that technical assistance. PRDE provided the required information.

The Department imposed Specific Conditions on Puerto Rico Department of Education's (PRDE's) IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years. Those conditions are in effect at the time of the Department’s 2023 determination.

## Intro - Required Actions

The Puerto Rico Department of Education's (PRDE) IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In PRDE's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised PRDE of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required PRDE to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed PRDE to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. PRDE must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which PRDE received assistance; and (2) the actions PRDE took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2018 | 66.93% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 56.80% | 56.90% | 57.00% | 70.99% | 60.00% |
| Data | 80.12% | 70.99% | 70.98% | 67.8%[[2]](#footnote-3) | 78.18% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 62.00% | 64.00% | 65.00% | 66.00% | 67.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 5,306 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 393 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 194 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 2,621 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5,306 | 8,514 | 78.18% | 62.00% | 62.32% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

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

The requirement of PRDE is 24 credits to graduate with a regular high school diploma (Circular letter Number 34-2016-2017).

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

NO

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

## 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 who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

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

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

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

Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

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.

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 43.36% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 34.50% | 34.00% | 33.50% | 33.00% | 32.00% |
| Data | 32.34% | 25.46% | 24.80% | 23.11% | 16.23% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 35.00% | 34.50% | 34.00% | 33.50% | 33.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 5,306 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 393 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 194 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 2,621 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2,621 | 8,514 | 16.23% | 35.00% | 30.78% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

PRDE defines "drop out" for all youth using the same definition as used for EDFacts reporting requirements. Specifically, these are students who were enrolled in school at some time during the school year, were not enrolled the following school year, but were expected to be in membership (i.e., were not reported as dropouts the year before); did not graduate from high school (graduates include students who received a GED without dropping out of school) or complete a state or district-approved educational program; and did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (1) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program, (2) temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness, or (3) death.

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

NO

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

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

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, PRDE noted its plans to closely monitor exiting data and consider, in continued consultation with stakeholders, whether future revisions to Indicator 2 targets may be appropriate, particularly considering the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. As then noted, while the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 may have impacted 2019-2020 data, we anticipated further impacts due to the pandemic for 2020-2021. PRDE schools operated virtually for essentially the entire 2020-2021 school year. After initially being shut down effective March 14, 2020 as part of a government lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Puerto Rico schools remained physically closed for the majority of the 2020-2021 school year. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021. Unfortunately, Puerto Rico experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all PRDE schools were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021 and remained closed for in-person learning for the remainder of the 2020-2021 school year.

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly impacted the school system and the economy, and those impacts are reflected in the exiting data. In reviewing historic data, PRDE experienced a significant impact on Ind. 2 data following the period of the great recession, a challenging economic period which both contributed to and was compounded by the fiscal crisis in Puerto Rico. PRDE saw a significant increase in the drop-out rate data reported through Indicator 2 in the FFY2010-2012 APRs (2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012) (41.59%, 43.36%, 44.81%). Similar economic factors and challenges experienced then are being felt again, and as anticipated, PRDE is experiencing an increase in drop-out rate following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the 2019-2020 school year being cut short several months because of the initial shutdown, PRDE’s FFY 2020 data for Ind. 2 is likely artificially low. Meanwhile, the challenges of a 2020-2021 virtual school year for students and families, including related economic impact, likely contributed to an increase in the drop-out rate. The economic impact and challenges felt in returning to an in-person 2021-2022 school year is expected to continue to have an impact on the drop-out rate.

Students’ reasons for exiting the regular diploma program vary from the need to work in search of economic independence or due to a lack of resources, to school apathy or a desire for less rigorous academic challenges. Students who are counted as “dropping out” under this definition include students who are leaving their educational placements to engage in other academic alternatives to complete high school graduation requirements—just not with a regular diploma or certificate. Many are enrolled in alternative programs that provide educational and training services that may allow them to enroll in universities and/or find jobs. Such opportunities may allow them to achieve and maintain employment and/or establish their own business.
In light of these considerations, after closely monitoring exiting data and analyzing historic data and trends, PRDE, in consultation with stakeholders, determined that revisions to its Indicator 2 targets is appropriate at this time. Discussions with stakeholders emphasized that establishing targets is more than just identifying a goal, but that targets are a metric that we want to, and believe we can, achieve. Several factors considered in establishing meaningful targets included that they be realistic and attainable while aiming to improve outcomes and results each year. The revised targets all remain under (i.e., show improvement compared to) PRDE’s baseline. PRDE’s proposed revisions to its targets are as follows:

FFY 2021 Target: 35%
FFY 2022 Target: 34.5%
FFY 2023 Target: 34%
FFY 2024 Target: 33.5%
FFY 2025 Target: 33%

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

PRDE submitted its targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 96.00% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 95.85% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 95.73% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 95.49% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 95.44% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 95.15% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 96.00% | 96.00%  | 96.00% | 96.00% | 96.10% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.85% | 95.85% | 95.90% | 95.95% | 96.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 95.73% | 95.75% | 95.75% | 95.80% | 95.83% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 95.49% | 95.50% | 95.50% | 95.55% | 95.60% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 95.44% | 95.50% | 95.50% | 95.55% | 95.60% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 95.15% | 95.20% | 95.20% | 95.25% | 95.30% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 6,393 | 6,644 | 5,035 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 994 | 1,138 | 882 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4,985 | 5,099 | 3,798 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 158 | 131 | 140 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 6,383 | 6,652 | 5,034 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 982 | 1,141 | 866 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 4,955 | 5,080 | 3,786 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 158 | 128 | 138 |

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

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6,137 | 6,393 |  | 96.00% | 96.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 6,368 | 6,644 |  | 95.85% | 95.85% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 4,820 | 5,035 |  | 95.73% | 95.73% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 6,095 | 6,383 |  | 95.49% | 95.49% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 6,349 | 6,652 |  | 95.44% | 95.44% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 4,790 | 5,034 |  | 95.15% | 95.15% | 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.**

Puerto Rico's publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2021, including public reporting on participation of students with disabilities, is published and available on PRDE's website at: . Information https://perfilescolar.dde.pr/dashboard/summary/index.html?schoolcode=State regarding student participation on Puerto Rico’s statewide assessment (META-PR Tests) appears in the first block of data on the left hand side of the page (“Student Participation in META-PR Tests”). Immediately above that block, the viewer can select the subject and grade level for which to see the student participation data on each the regular and alternate META-PR test. To view the participation data of only students with disabilities on each the regular and the alternate META-PR test, the viewer can filter the data by clicking on the filter icon next to “ALL STUDENTS” at the top of the page (the icon resembles a funnel) and then selecting “With Disabilities”. At the bottom of this first block of data, a link is provided to view data that includes the number participation data that reflects the number of children who were provided accommodations. This link brings the viewer to the current Ind. 3 of Puerto Rico’s corresponding SPP/APR. To view school-level data, the viewer should click on the magnifying glass icon in the upper right-hand corner of the page. This will open a field that reads “Type to search a school”, allowing the viewer to type in the school name for which it would like to view school level data. Additionally, PRDE's SPP/APR, which will be published once the final version can be extracted from the EMAPS system, provides detailed data on assessment accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

As noted by OSEP in the “Prior FFY Required Actions” section below, PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements for the 2020-2021 school year, and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission. As such, PRDE was required to provide baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 for Indicator 3 in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. PRDE has provided the required baselines and targets.

This is the first year for which PRDE has set a baseline and targets regarding the participation of children with IEPs on statewide assessments (previously Ind. 3B, now Ind. 3A) that is broken down by grade level. Previously, PRDE reported on the aggregated participation levels for both reading and math (i.e., two baselines and targets each year). Now, PRDE is reporting on 6 different participation rates—both math and reading at each the 4th grade, 8th grade, and high school levels (i.e., six baselines and targets each year). Moreover, when PRDE reported just two data points, the baseline year was 2005, eighteen (18) years ago. Due to the new need to set baselines for data disaggregated by grade level, PRDE determined, in consultation with stakeholders, that it was appropriate to establish baselines based on current year data.

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator, as required by the measurement table. In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE must provide the required baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025..

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3A - OSEP Response

PRDE has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

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

## 3A - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of PRDE's 2023 determination letter, PRDE must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds PRDE that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, PRDE must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 27.43% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 17.00% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 14.44% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 35.69% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 4.00% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 1.46% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 27.43% | 27.50% | 27.50% | 27.60% | 27.70% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 17.00% | 17.10% | 17.10% | 17.20% | 17.30% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 14.44% | 14.50% | 14.50% | 14.55% | 14.60% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 35.69% | 35.70% | 35.75% | 35.75% | 35.80% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 4.00% | 4.10% | 4.10% | 4.15% | 4.20% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 1.46% | 1.50% | 1.50% | 1.55% | 1.60% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 5,979 | 6,237 | 4,680 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 302 | 184 | 151 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,338 | 876 | 525 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 5,937 | 6,221 | 4,652 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 368 | 53 | 15 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,751 | 196 | 53 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 1,640 | 5,979 |  | 27.43% | 27.43% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 1,060 | 6,237 |  | 17.00% | 17.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 676 | 4,680 |  | 14.44% | 14.44% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 2,119 | 5,937 |  | 35.69% | 35.69% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 249 | 6,221 |  | 4.00% | 4.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 68 | 4,652 |  | 1.46% | 1.46% | 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.**

Puerto Rico's publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2021, including public reporting on participation of students with disabilities, is published and available on PRDE's website at: . Information https://perfilescolar.dde.pr/dashboard/summary/index.html?schoolcode=State regarding student performance of all students on Puerto Rico’s statewide assessment (META-PR Tests) appears in the first block of data on the right-hand side of the page (“Performance by Subject and Level”), with more detailed performance data appearing in several data blocks following that first block, including performance results by subgroup (e.g., students with disabilities). Immediately above the first data block, the viewer can select the subject and grade level for which to view the student performance data. To view performance data of only students with disabilities, the viewer can filter the data by clicking on the filter icon next to “ALL STUDENTS” at the top of the page (the icon resembles a funnel) and then selecting “With Disabilities”. At the bottom of the first block of data, a link is provided to view data that includes performance data specific to those children who were provided accommodations and those children who took the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards. This link brings the viewer to the current Ind. 3 of Puerto Rico’s corresponding SPP/APR. To view school-level data, the viewer should click on the magnifying glass icon in the upper right-hand corner of the page. This will open a field that reads “Type to search a school”, allowing the viewer to type in the school name for which it would like to view school level data. Additionally, PRDE's SPP/APR, which will be published once the final version can be extracted from the EMAPS system, provides detailed data on assessment accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

As noted by OSEP in the “Prior FFY Required Actions” section below, PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements for the 2020-2021 school year, and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission. As such, PRDE was required to provide baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 for Indicator 3 in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. PRDE has provided the required baselines and targets.

This is the first year for which PRDE has set a baseline and targets regarding the proficiency of children with IEPs on statewide assessments that is broken down by grade level. Additionally, proficiency rate was previously reported under Indicator 3C, but it is now reported separately for (i) children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards (regular assessment) under the new Ind. 3B and (ii) children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards (alternate assessment) under the new Indicator 3C. As such, where PRDE previously reported on just two proficiency rates each year (one for math and one for reading), PRDE is now reporting on twelve (12) different proficiency rates each year (six each year for each of the new Indicators 3B and 3C—both math and reading at each the 4th grade, 8th grade, and HS level). Moreover, when PRDE reported just two proficiency rates, the baseline year was 2008, eighteen (15) years ago. Due to the need to set baselines for data disaggregated by both grade levels and assessment version (regular assessment for Ind. 3B and alternate assessment for Ind. 3C), PRDE determined, in consultation with stakeholders, that it was appropriate to establish baselines based on the most recent available data, i.e., current year data.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator, as required by the measurement table. In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE must provide the required baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3B - OSEP Response

PRDE has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

## 3B - Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 55.06% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 57.25% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 60.00% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 59.49% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 44.53% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 58.70% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 56.06% | 55.10% | 55.10% | 55.15% | 55.20% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 57.25% | 57.30% | 57.30% | 57.35% | 57.40% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 60.00% | 60.00% | 60.05% | 60.10% | 60.10% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 59.49% | 59.50% | 59.50% | 59.55% | 59.60% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 44.53% | 44.55% | 44.60% | 44.60% | 44.65% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 58.70% | 58.70% | 58.75% | 58.75% | 58.80% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 158 | 131 | 140 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 87 | 75 | 84 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 158 | 128 | 138 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 94 | 57 | 81 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 87 | 158 |  | 56.06% | 55.06% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 75 | 131 |  | 57.25% | 57.25% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 84 | 140 |  | 60.00% | 60.00% | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 94 | 158 |  | 59.49% | 59.49% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 57 | 128 |  | 44.53% | 44.53% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 81 | 138 |  | 58.70% | 58.70% | 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.**

Puerto Rico's publicly reported statewide assessment data for FFY 2021, including public reporting on participation of students with disabilities, is published and available on PRDE's website at: https://perfilescolar.dde.pr/dashboard/standardizedtest/?schoolcode=State. Information regarding student performance of all students on Puerto Rico’s statewide assessment (META-PR Tests) appears in the first block of data on the right hand side of the page (“Performance by Subject and Level”), with more detailed performance data appearing in several data blocks following that first block, including performance results by subgroup (e.g., students with disabilities). Immediately above the first data block, the viewer can select the subject and grade level for which to view the student performance data. To view performance data of only students with disabilities, the viewer can filter the data by clicking on the filter icon next to “ALL STUDENTS” at the top of the page (the icon resembles a funnel) and then selecting “With Disabilities”. At the bottom of the first block of data, a link is provided to view data that includes performance data specific to those children who were provided accommodations and those children who took the alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards. This link brings the viewer to the current Ind. 3 of Puerto Rico’s corresponding SPP/APR. To view school-level data, the viewer should click on the magnifying glass icon in the upper right hand corner of the page. This will open a field that reads “Type to search a school”, allowing the viewer to type in the school name for which it would like to view school level data. Additionally, PRDE's SPP/APR, which will be published once the final version can be extracted from the EMAPS system, provides detailed data on assessment accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

As noted by OSEP in the “Prior FFY Required Actions” section below, PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements for the 2020-2021 school year, and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission. As such, PRDE was required to provide baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 for Indicator 3 in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. PRDE has provided the required baselines and targets.
This is the first year for which PRDE has set baselines and targets regarding the proficiency of children with IEPs on statewide assessments that is broken down by grade level. Additionally, proficiency rate was previously reported under Indicator 3C, but it is now reported separately for (i) children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards (regular assessment) under the new Ind. 3B and (ii) children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards (alternate assessment) under the new Indicator 3C. As such, where PRDE previously reported on just two proficiency rates each year (one for math and one for reading), PRDE is now reporting on twelve (12) different proficiency rates each year (six each year for each of the new Indicators 3B and 3C—both math and reading at each the 4th grade, 8th grade, and HS level). Moreover, when PRDE reported just two proficiency rates, the baseline year was 2008, fifteen (15) years ago. Due to the need to set baselines for data disaggregated by both grade levels and assessment version (regular assessment for Ind. 3B and alternate assessment for Ind. 3C), PRDE determined, in consultation with stakeholders, that it was appropriate to establish these baselines based on the most recent available data, i.e., current year data.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator, as required by the measurement table. In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE must provide the required baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3C - OSEP Response

PRDE has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

## 3C - Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group**  | **Group Name**  | **Baseline Year**  | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 9.51 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 17.64 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 22.58 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 6.52 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 1.89 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 3.92 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 9.51 | 9.50  | 9.50 | 9.45 | 9.40 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 17.64 | 17.60 | 17.60 | 17.55 | 17.50 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 22.58 | 22.50 | 22.50 | 22.45 | 22.45 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 6.52 | 6.52 | 6.51 | 6.50 | 6.50 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 1.88 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 3.91 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 18,272 | 20,537 | 19,319 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 5,979 | 6,237 | 4,680 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 5,238 | 6,148 | 6,430 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,511 | 965 | 722 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 302 | 184 | 151 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,338 | 876 | 525 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 18,165 | 20,468 | 19,210 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 5,937 | 6,221 | 4,652 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 5,718 | 997 | 958 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,949 | 210 | 75 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 368 | 53 | 15 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 1,751 | 196 | 53 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 27.43% | 36.94% |  | 9.51 | 9.51 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 17.00% | 34.64% |  | 17.64 | 17.64 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 14.44% | 37.02% |  | 22.58 | 22.58 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards**  | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 35.69% | 42.21% |  | 6.52 | 6.52 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 4.00% | 5.90% |  | 5.00 | 1.89 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | 1.46% | 5.38% |  | 5.00 | 3.92 | N/A | N/A |

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

As noted by OSEP in the “Prior FFY Required Actions” section below, PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements for the 2020-2021 school year, and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator with the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission. As such, PRDE was required to provide baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 for Indicator 3D in its FFY 2021 SPP/APR. PRDE has provided the required baselines and targets. This represents the establishment of the baseline for Indicator 3D, not a revision to the baseline. As this is a new indicator, PRDE determined, in consultation with stakeholders, that it was appropriate to establish its baselines based on the most recent available data, i.e., current year data.

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

PRDE received a waiver of the assessment requirements and as a result, did not provide baselines or targets for this indicator, as required by the measurement table. In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE must provide the required baselines and targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3D - OSEP Response

PRDE has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

PRDE submitted its targets for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 0.10% | 0.10% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
|  | 0 |  | 0.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

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

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

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

PRDE is a unitary system, serving as both the SEA and the sole LEA in Puerto Rico. PRDE is composed of seven educational regions. Previously, PRDE operated four school districts within each educational region (a total of 28 school districts). During FFY 2018, PRDE eliminated the administrative district divisions within each educational region while maintaining the seven education regions, now known as the Oficina Regional Educativa (or OREs, by its acronym in Spanish). While the OREs may in some ways operate similarly to school districts, they do not constitute LEAs, and this does not impact PRDE's status as a unitary system.

PRDE’s status as a unitary system makes applying the actual measurement for Indicator 4a challenging; however, as discussed below, PRDE worked closely with OSEP to determine an appropriate methodology to reporting under Ind. 4a.

On July 10, 2015, OSEP issued a letter to PRDE providing instructions as to the methodologies OSEP would require PRDE, as a unitary system, to use in reporting on Indicator 4A in the FFY 2014 and future SPP/APR submissions. Specifically, OSEP provided PRDE with two methodology options. As reported in the FFY 2014 SPP/APR, PRDE selected to employ the second option offered in OSEP’s letter: to compare the rates of children with disabilities suspended or expelled among districts, although they are not LEAs as defined under the IDEA.

As such, beginning with the FFY 2014 SPP/APR, PRDE compared the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 28 school districts (although they are not LEAs) within Puerto Rico. With the administrative change eliminating the 28 school districts, PRDE began comparing the rates of suspension and expulsion for children with IEPs among the 7 OREs (although they are not LEAs) beginning with the FFY 2018 APR submission.

Under this methodology, PRDE compares ORE rates for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to the statewide bar, defined below, for suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities to evaluate comparability. An ORE is determined to have a significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least five percentage points more than the state’s average suspension expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (the “statewide bar”).

The statewide bar is calculated by (i) first calculating the state’s average suspension expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (i.e., the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate) and (ii) then adding five percentage points. The state’s average suspension expulsion rate for all children with disabilities (i.e., the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate) is calculated by dividing the statewide total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days in a school year by the statewide total number of students with disabilities. PRDE uses a minimum “n” size requirement to exclude OREs from the calculation. Thus, if the ORE has fewer than 10 students with disabilities who were suspended more than 10 school days during the data reporting year, that ORE is not included in the calculation. ORE rates are calculated by dividing the ORE’s total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days by the total number of students with disabilities in the ORE.

In reviewing all 7 OREs for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE found that none of the 7 OREs met the minimum n size for this indicator. As such, no further analysis was required.

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

For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the relevant data for Indicator 4a corresponds to the 2020-2021 school year. PRDE’s total number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 school days during the 2020-2021 school year was zero (0). As such, the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for the 2020-2021 school year was 0% (as was the rate for each of the OREs).

Important for context, and as discussed in the introduction section to this SPP/APR, PRDE schools operated virtually for essentially the entire 2020-2021 school year. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021, but unfortunately, Puerto Rico experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all PRDE schools were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021, and remained closed for in-person learning for the remainder of the 2020-2021 school year. Operating schools virtually for the entire 2020-2021 school year is expected to have resulted in lower than normal suspensions and expulsions.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 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 2020**

| **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 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR PRDE included none of the Oficinas Regional Educativa (Regional Education Offices (OREs, by its acronym in Spanish)) in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP recognizes the PRDE reported, "Operating schools virtually for the entire 2020-2021 school year is expected to have resulted in lower than normal suspensions and expulsions." OSEP reminds PRDE that if the examination for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the ORE level, OSEP may determine that PRDE's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

PRDE's chosen methodology results in a threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs that falls above the median of thresholds used by all States.

## 4A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the PRDE must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the PRDE’s OREs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the PRDE’s chosen methodology, and how the PRDE’s threshold for measuring significant discrepancy in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions is reasonably designed.

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:**

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 4B- Required Actions

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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 77.33% | 77.67% | 77.85% | 67.25% | 67.75% |
| A | 67.74% | Data | 76.27% | 72.09% | 67.24% | 67.74% | 78.99% |
| B | 2019 | Target <= | 6.70% | 6.20% | 5.70% | 8.93% | 9.65% |
| B | 9.43% | Data | 8.64% | 9.22% | 8.94% | 9.43% | 8.76% |
| C | 2019 | Target <= | 3.40% | 3.20% | 3.00% | 3.00% | 2.50% |
| C | 1.72% | Data | 2.30% | 2.23% | 1.83% | 1.72% | 1.67% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 67.80% | 67.85% | 67.90% | 67.95% | 68.00% |
| Target B <= | 9.60% | 9.55% | 9.50% | 9.45% | 9.40% |
| Target C <= | 2.40% | 2.30% | 2.20% | 2.10% | 1.71% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 82,666 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 62,043 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 9,597 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 1,054 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 3 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 356 |

**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 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 62,043 | 82,666 | 78.99% | 67.80% | 75.05% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 9,597 | 82,666 | 8.76% | 9.60% | 11.61% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 1,413 | 82,666 | 1.67% | 2.40% | 1.71% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **B** | The FFY 2021 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 5B. While it is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage, one possible reason may be related to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Following the initial PRDE systemwide school closures in response to COVID-19 during the 2019-2020 school year (on March 14, 2020), PRDE schools generally remained physically closed for the entire 2020-2021 school year. While PRDE resumed the educational curriculum at the start of the 2020-2021 school year, virtual programming was provided. A limited number of schools began to open for in-person learning on March 15, 2021. Unfortunately, PR experienced a significant spike in COVID-19 cases shortly thereafter, and all schools island-wide were again closed by government order issued April 8, 2021. Only a small group of schools reopened for in-person learning in early May 2021 until the end of the school year the first week of June 2021. In considering reasons for slippage with Indicator 5B, it is possible that the extended period of time students were outside of the traditional ‘brick-and-mortar’ school settings led to IEP team determinations that may have required an increase of educational and related services to be provided outside of the general education classroom setting. PRDE plans to closely monitor the data and hold discussions with stakeholders related to Indicator 5, including whether consideration of whether targets should be revised. |

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

## 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:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

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

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

 C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

 A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

 C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **A** | Target >= | 73.50% | 74.00% | 74.50% | 75.00% | 79.00% |
| **A** | Data | 78.46% | 79.21% | 86.12% | 81.82% | 81.58% |
| **B** | Target <= | 0.72% | 0.71% | 0.70% | 0.70% | 0.70% |
| **B** | Data | 0.19% | 0.20% | 0.23% | 0.15% | 0.25% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**Targets**

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2019 | 81.82% |
| **B** | 2019 | 0.15% |
| **C** | 2020 | 0.40% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 79.50% | 80.00% | 80.50% | 81.00% | 81.83% |
| Target B <= | 0.60% | 0.50% | 0.40% | 0.30% | 0.14% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 0.70% | 0.60% | 0.50% | 0.45% | 0.39% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 1,955 | 3,013 | 1,857 | 6,825 |
| 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 | 1,256 | 2,517 | 1,779 | 5,552 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 1 | 6 | 14 | 21 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility |  |  |  |  |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 62 | 68 | 14 | 144 |

**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 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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 | 5,552 | 6,825 | 81.58% | 79.50% | 81.35% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 21 | 6,825 | 0.25% | 0.60% | 0.31% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Home | 144 | 6,825 | 0.40% | 0.70% | 2.11% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

The FFY 2021 APR reflects slippage with Indicator 6C. It is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage, particularly as Ind. 6c was a new component beginning with last year’s APR. One possible reason may be related to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, including increased interest in provision of services particularly for the youngest students in home settings. PRDE plans to closely monitor the data and hold discussions with stakeholders related to Indicator 6, including whether consideration of whether targets should be revised.

**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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 87.50% | 88.00% | 94.11% | 94.11% | 45.00% |
| A1 | 94.10% | Data | 90.93% | 83.17% | 73.02% | 38.00% | 46.56% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 57.80% | 58.00% | 58.20% | 56.01% | 50.00% |
| A2 | 56.00% | Data | 49.55% | 52.33% | 42.81% | 49.81% | 50.58% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 86.40% | 86.60% | 89.71% | 89.71% | 45.00% |
| B1 | 89.70% | Data | 89.29% | 80.00% | 67.85% | 39.67% | 49.88% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 50.00% | 50.20% | 50.40% | 48.81% | 39.00% |
| B2 | 48.80% | Data | 44.28% | 43.19% | 31.64% | 41.90% | 41.99% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 91.60% | 91.80% | 95.51% | 95.51% | 45.00% |
| C1 | 95.50% | Data | 94.10% | 85.06% | 75.76% | 40.88% | 51.18% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 69.80% | 69.90% | 72.21% | 72.21% | 50.00% |
| C2 | 72.20% | Data | 53.61% | 56.74% | 47.29% | 55.99% | 51.43% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 50.00% | 55.00% | 60.00% | 65.00% | 94.11% |
| Target A2 >= | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 54.00% | 56.01% |
| Target B1 >= | 50.00% | 55.00% | 59.00% | 64.00% | 89.71% |
| Target B2 >= | 39.25% | 39.50% | 40.00% | 45.00% | 48.81% |
| Target C1 >= | 51.00% | 57.00% | 63.00% | 70.00% | 95.51% |
| Target C2 >= | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% | 55.00% | 72.21% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

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

4,083

**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 | 307 | 7.52% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,201 | 29.41% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 472 | 11.56% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 599 | 14.67% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,504 | 36.84% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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)* | 1,071 | 2,579 | 46.56% | 50.00% | 41.53% | Did not meet target | 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)* | 2,103 | 4,083 | 50.58% | 51.00% | 51.51% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 273 | 6.69% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,390 | 34.04% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 725 | 17.76% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 780 | 19.10% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 915 | 22.41% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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)* | 1,505 | 3,168 | 49.88% | 50.00% | 47.51% | 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)* | 1,695 | 4,083 | 41.99% | 39.25% | 41.51% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 287 | 7.03% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1,153 | 28.24% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 650 | 15.92% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 775 | 18.98% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,218 | 29.83% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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)*  | 1,425 | 2,865 | 51.18% | 51.00% | 49.74% | 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)* | 1,993 | 4,083 | 51.43% | 51.00% | 48.81% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A1** | Slippage may be due in part to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. For PRDE, the 2020-2021 school year generally was 100% virtual. As such, the 2021-2022 school year was a return to in-person learning following an extended period (18 months, March 2020-August 2022). This may have impacted both student performance and data collection in how the outcomes forms were approached and completed. Additionally, PRDE may have been overly ambitious in its target setting for Outcome A1 (targets aimed for annual improvement of 5%).  |
| **B1** | Slippage may be due in part to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. For PRDE, the 2020-2021 school year generally was 100% virtual. As such, the 2021-2022 school year was a return to in-person learning following an extended period (18 months, March 2020-August 2022). This may have impacted both student performance and data collection in how the outcomes forms were approached and completed. Additionally, PRDE may have been overly ambitious in its target setting for Outcome B1 (targets aimed for annual improvement of 5%).  |
| **C1** | Slippage may be due in part to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. For PRDE, the 2020-2021 school year generally was 100% virtual. As such, the 2021-2022 school year was a return to in-person learning following an extended period (18 months, March 2020-August 2022). This may have impacted both student performance and data collection in how the outcomes forms were approached and completed. Additionally, PRDE may have been overly ambitious in its target setting for Outcome C1 (targets aimed for annual improvement of 6%).  |
| **C2** | Slippage may be due in part to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. For PRDE, the 2020-2021 school year generally was 100% virtual. As such, the 2021-2022 school year was a return to in-person learning following an extended period (18 months, March 2020-August 2022). This may have impacted both student performance and data collection in how the outcomes forms were approached and completed. |

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

YES

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

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

YES

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

The process of data collection begins by completing the Resúmen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar (a translation of ECO’s COSF). When the child exits preschool services, after having received services for at least six months, exit data is gathered using the same document (again, the Resumen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar) to determine the child’s outcomes in accordance with this indicator’s measurement. Since FFY 2017, PRDE has included the Resumen de Resultados de la Intervención con el Niño(a) Preescolar within the PRDE special education information system, MiPE. To complete this document, the SAEE has oriented personnel to collect this information in two parts. The first part of the document is filled during the eligibility determination process through MiPE. The second part is filled when the child exited the preschool services. PRDE SAEE prepared a memorandum that reviewed the instructions for indicator B7 in MiPE. In addition, a user guide for the system was created and published. Monthly follow-up was offered to schools in order to ensure the collection of required data, including the completion of the document. Staff involved in this was trained in the use of this document in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation.

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

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**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 86.09% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 87.70% | 88.70% | 86.10% | 86.10% | 84.00% |
| Data | 84.75% | 86.09% | 86.15% | 82.35% | 86.39% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 84.50% | 85.00% | 85.50% | 86.00% | 86.10% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 254 | 306 | 86.39% | 84.50% | 83.01% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The FFY 2021 APR reflects slippage with Indicator B8. While it is difficult to determine a definitive reason for the slippage, one possible reason may be related to short period of time PRDE had to distribute the survey and collect data. PRDE have had various meetings with the technical assistance provider in order to receive feedback of its Sampling Plan. PRDE plans to closely monitor the data and hold discussions with stakeholders related to Indicator 8.

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

PRDE includes all students served under Part B in its information system, and, at the time that PRDE selects its sample, all students served under Part B are included. The same process is employed for issuing the survey to parents of all selected students, regardless of whether the student is a preschool student.

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

383

**Percentage of respondent parents**

79.90%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate  | 93.99% | 79.90% |

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

PRDE will implement various strategies which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented. These strategies include closely monitoring progress with obtaining responses, assessing response rate at regular intervals, and using multiple forms of follow-up (e.g., phone calls, email, text messages) in effort to continuously improve the response rate, particularly for those groups that may have been identified as underrepresented. In monitoring progress with obtaining responses and assessing the response rate at regular intervals, PRDE will monitor progress and assess response rate by demographic groups including geographic educational region and race/ethnicity throughout the data collection period.

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

As noted below, PRDE's analysis of the response data reflected that the data is representative of the demographics of the children for whom parents responded. PRDE analyzed the response rate, and determined the following response rates by PRDE Educational Region (Geographic Regions):

Response Rate by PRDE Educational Region (Geographic Region):
Arecibo: 64%
Bayamon: 86%
Caguas: 100%
Humacao: 95%
Mayaguez: 88%
Ponce: 74%
San Juan: 58%

As reflected above, the response rate by PRDE Educational Region (Geographic Region) ranged from 58% to 100%. While four of the seven regions had relatively high response rates (86%-100%), three regions had lower response rates (58%-74%). While the overall respondents are representative of the geographic educational regions, it is possible that lower response rates from certain regions may be indicative of potential nonresponse bias. As described above, PRDE will implement various strategies to increase the response rate year over year, including monitoring progress and assessing response rate by geographic educational region throughout the collection period.

In terms of analysis of the response rate by racial/ethnic group, as reported below, over 99.8% of PRDE students identify as Hispanic, with less than 0.2% of students identifying under any other race/ethnic groups. Analysis of this year’s random sample reflected that 100% of those selected for the sample identify as Hispanic, which statistically is appropriate in light of the make-up of the overall population. Accordingly, no issue of nonresponse bias was identified. PRDE has included race/ethnicity in its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of children receiving special education services because it was a required item for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Indicator 8 reporting. As over 99.8% of PRDE students identify as Hispanic, PRDE likely would not have selected this demographic for analysis if it were not required.

**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.** **States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

PRDE analyzed respondent data and determined the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services (target population). The response group accurately reflects the target population. For example, the following lists note the make-up of the target population and the representativeness of each response data by (i) race/ethnicity and (ii) geographic educational region. For each race/ethnicity category and geographic region, the percentage make-up of the target population for that classification is listed followed by the percentage make-up of the response data for that group of responders.

Comparing Target Population % to Response Data % by Race/Ethnicity:
Asian: 0.02%, 0.00%
White, Not Hispanic: 0.12%, 0.00%
Hispanic/Latino: 99.82%, 100%
Native American: 0.03%, 0.00%
Black, Not Hispanic: 0.02%, 0.00%

Comparing Target Population % to Response Data % by PRDE Educational Region (Geographical Regions):
Arecibo: 14.23%, 11.44%
Bayamon: 15.32%, 16.67%
Caguas: 14.34%,17.97%
Humacao: 10.63%, 12.75%
Mayaguez: 14.53%, 16.01%
Ponce: 13.78%, 12.75%
San Juan: 17.18%, 12.42%

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

YES

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

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

The metric used to determine representativeness is +/- 5%.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used?  | YES |
| If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed? | NO |

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

For this indicator, PRDE translated the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring Parent Survey-Special Education (version 2). The translation of the survey was adapted and used to measure the opportunities for parent involvement in their children’s special education provision of services. The “Inventario para padres de estudiantes que reciben servicios de Educacion Especial” was administered to a random sample of parents of children 3-22 years old. The sample size was 383 parents. Parents were randomly selected from the data base of special education students receiving services. The random sampling methodology used is based on Vera (2005) and Cornett & Beckner (1975). This method states that the sample of 383 is an appropriate sample for an N size of 100,000. PRDE’s special student population is 89,491.

Parents who answered “bastante” or “mucho” (numbers 4 and 5 on a 1-5 scale) on questions regarding parental involvement, were counted as reporting the schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

A random selection of parents was used for survey administration. As PRDE’s special education population for FFY 2020 was 89,491 the sample size would need to be at least 383 parents of students receiving special education services for 2021-2022. Determination of the required sample was defined by the following formula:

s = [X²NP(1-P)] / [d²(N-1) + X²P(1-P)]
Where:
s = required sample size
X² = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841)
 N = population size
P = the population proportion (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size)
d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05)

Accordingly, with a universe/population size (N) of 89,491:

s = [(3.841) (89,491) (.50) (1-.50)] / [(.05)(.05)( 89,491-1) + (3.841) (.50) (1-.50)]
= [(343,734.931) (.50) (1-.50) ] / [ (.0025) (89,491) + 1.9205 (.50) ]
= [ 171,867.466) (.50) ] / [ 223.7275 + .96025]
= [ 85,933.7328] / [224.68775]
= 382.725
s = 383 parents

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

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

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

OSEP’s response to the State’s initial FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission required the State to submit a revised sampling plan for this indicator by June 1, 2023. The State has submitted a revised plan and OSEP’s evaluation of the plan indicates that it is approvable.

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**Instructions**

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 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 the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**Instructions**

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below**

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

## 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 70.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.51% | 96.65% | 97.99% | 96.17% | 98.65% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9,903 | 9,587 | 98.65% | 100% | 96.81% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage**

PRDE faces a shorter timeline that the Federal requirement (60 days), due to the Rosa Lydia Velez consent decree, which mandates PRDE complete evaluations within a 30-day period. Despite PRDE facing this shorter timeline, PRDE ensured that 96.81% of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received in FFY 2021 had evaluations completed within 30 days.

PRDE has dedicated significant resources to ensuring compliance with this requirement and has shown significant and steady progress over the years. Since FFY 2013, PRDE consistently has achieved substantial compliance (>95%) with the Indicator 11 requirements. The data for FFY 2021 reflects slippage compared to FFY 2020 (decrease from 98.65% to 96.81%). This slippage is attributable to challenges the school system faced during the 2021-2022 school year, including a significant increase in the number of children from whom parental consent to evaluate was received. Compared to the prior year, that number increased 45.67% (from 6,794 to 9,903).

Despite such challenges, PRDE staff and evaluation teams worked incredibly hard with students and their families to ensure compliance with the strict timeline. PRDE was able to ensure for FFY 2021 that 96.81% of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received were evaluated within 30 days and that 99.31% were evaluated within 60 days. PRDE remains committed to ensuring all children for whom parental consent to evaluate is received are evaluated within Puerto Rico's strict 30-day timeline.

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

316

**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.**

Below, PRDE presents the ranges of days within which FFY 2021 initial evaluations were held. It reflects the total number and percentages of FFY 2021 initial evaluations both within and beyond Puerto Rico's mandated 30-day timeline for completing an initial evaluation. For those 316 evaluations completed beyond the 30-day timeline, PRDE presents the number and percent of evaluations that were completed within several range of day groupings. Reasons for the delays include data entry errors, parent failure to keep scheduled appointments, or situations causing meetings to be rescheduled due to unavailability of a required party. Notably, 248 of the 316 evaluations at issue were completed within 31 to 60 days. This means that 99.31% of FFY 2021 evaluations were completed within the federal timeline of 60 days (9,587 + 248 = 9,835; and, 9,835 / 9,903 = 99.31%).

Total # of children with parental consent to evaluate = 9,903
Eval. Within 30 days or less = 9,587
Eval. Within 31-60 days = 248
Eval. Within 61-90 days = 41
Eval. Within 91-120 days = 9
Eval. possibly in more than 120 days = 11

As reflected above, PRDE completed 99.31% of FFY 2021 initial evaluations (9,835) within 60 days, and 96.81% within Puerto Rico's stricter mandated 30-day timeline. Furthermore, PRDE has verified that 100% of children with parental consent to evaluate in FFY 2021 have received their evaluations.

**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).**

PRDE faces a shorter timeline than the Federal requirement (60 days), due to the Rosa Lydia Velez consent decree, which mandates PRDE complete evaluations within a 30-day period.

**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.**

PRDE maintains initial evaluation data within its State database, Mi Portal Especial (MiPE). CSEE level staff are responsible for entering initial evaluation data into MiPE. As part of PRDE's efforts to ensure compliance with its State mandated 30-day timeline, PRDE uses an initial evaluation appointment scheduling system to help track initial evaluation appointments and ensure they are scheduled and held timely. This system, which maintains an electronic data bank of available appointments including the date/time by service provider, records appointments made for student evaluations using the student identification number. This allows for proper identification and tracking of appointments made, as well as follow-up for reports on initial evaluations pending from service providers, improving PRDE’s controls over ensuring compliance with the 30-day timeline.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | 10 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

PRDE SAEE identified ten findings of noncompliance with Indicator 11 for FFY 2020, and PRDE SAEE has ensured timely correction of each of the ten findings of noncompliance. PRDE SAEE accounted for all instances of noncompliance, including noncompliance identified: (a) through the State's on-site monitoring system (self-assessment); (b) through the review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through a State data system (MiPE); and (c) by the Department. For the record, PRDE again notes that it is a unitary system; as such, PRDE is the sole LEA on the island. PRDE's determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Specifically, Puerto Rico verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 (i.e., PRDE, the sole LEA on the island): (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. Each finding was corrected within one year of identification.

For the first prong listed above (“is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements…based on a review of updated data”), the PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) reviewed initial evaluation data for a subsequent period of time and ascertained that children were evaluated in a timely manner, i.e., within 30 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation, in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301. Specifically, in reviewing initial evaluation data for a subsequent period of time, the MCU analyzed the number of days that passed between the date of parental consent for evaluation and the initial evaluation. Through this analysis, the MCU determined that 100% of the students for whom parental consent to evaluate was received during the subsequent period received their evaluation within 30 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301.

For the second prong (“has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA”), PRDE reviewed the list of students for whom parental consent to evaluate was obtained between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021, but whose initial evaluation was not timely, and then checked to make sure that an evaluation was completed for each child on that list, unless the child was no longer within jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, although late, by looking at evidence of the completion of the evaluation (i.e., evaluation report) in each Student’s file. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

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

PRDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. Specifically, PRDE ensured that for each child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, an evaluation was performed, although late. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

Specifically for this prong (“has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA”), as detailed in the above section as well, PRDE reviewed the list of students for whom parental consent to evaluate was obtained between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021, but whose initial evaluation was not timely, and then checked to make sure that an evaluation was completed for each child on that list, unless the child was no longer within jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, although late, by looking at evidence of the completion of the evaluation (i.e., evaluation report) in each Student’s file.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# 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.

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 13.17% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.41% | 97.11% | 98.57% | 97.06% | 96.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.  | 1,669 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.  | 10 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.  | 1,186 |
| 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.  | 424 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.  | 0 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 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. | 1,186 | 1,235 | 96.79% | 100% | 96.03% | Did not meet 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**

49

**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.**

The following information presents the range of days elapsed beyond the third birthday of these 49 children whose eligibility and services were not in place by the third birthday. Those 49 children represent just 2.9% of all children served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination during FFY 2021 (49/1,669). Reasons for the delays are discussed thereafter.

# of children receiving services from Part C and referred for eligibility determination during FFY 2021 and were not determined eligible or provided with services by their third birthday = 49

In place within 30 days following third birthday = 25
In place between 31 and 60 days of third birthday = 8
In place between 61 and 90 days of third birthday = 5
In place between 91 and 120 days of third birthday = 0
In place more than 120 days following third birthday = 11

Reasons for the delays include the following: late referral from the Part C program, data entry errors, new staff, parent failure to keep scheduled appointments, Part C failure to send transition meeting notices in a timely manner, and facilitator failure to attend transition meetings. During 2021-2022, PRDE continued to experience some impacts and delays on transition processes due to COVID infections.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

PRDE conducted island-wide data collection and several validation activities in order to obtain the number of children who had been served in Part C and referred to Part B, and the number found eligible who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. During FFY 2021, PRDE continued to give follow up to those children identified as potential participants of special education services. Each CSEE has knowledgeable staff that attends to each child from the referral process to the implementation of the IEP. This personnel is also responsible for ensuring data is continuously updated in the system.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11 | 11 |  | 0 |

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

PRDE SAEE identified 11 findings of noncompliance with Indicator 12 for FFY 2020, and PRDE SAEE has ensured timely correction of all 11 findings of noncompliance. PRDE SAEE accounted for all instances of noncompliance, including noncompliance identified: (a) through the State's on-site monitoring system (self-assessment); (b) through the review of data collected by the State, including compliance data collected through a State data system (MiPE); and (c) by the Department. For the record, PRDE again notes that it is a unitary system; as such, PRDE is the sole LEA on the island. PRDE's determination of timely correction of noncompliance was made consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Specifically, Puerto Rico verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 (i.e., PRDE, the sole LEA on the island): (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. The finding was corrected within one year of identification.

For the first prong listed above (“is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements…based on a review of updated data”), the PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) reviewed early childhood transition data for a subsequent period of time and ascertained that children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. Specifically, in reviewing early childhood transition data for a subsequent period of time, the MCU analyzed documentation regarding the dates upon which each child referred from Part C prior to age 3 during the subsequent period received an evaluation, and if determined eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented. Through this analysis, the MCU determined that 100% of those students in Puerto Rico who were referred from Part C prior to age 3 received their evaluations, and if determined eligible for Part B services, had an IEP developed and implemented by the time they turned 3 years old in accordance with the specific regulatory requirements.

For the second prong (“has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA”), PRDE reviewed the list of students for who were referred from Part C prior to age 3 between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021 to make sure that all students were evaluated, and if determined eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, even if late. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, IEP developed, and IEP implemented, even if late, by looking at student evaluation, IEP, and placement records. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

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

PRDE verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. Specifically, for each child referred from Part C for which there was noncompliance of the requirements of Indicator 12, PRDE verified that the child (unless no longer within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) was evaluated and received an eligibility determination for Part B, and if found eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, although late. PRDE verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance in a timely manner, i.e., within one year of identification of noncompliance.

Specifically for this prong (“has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA”), as detailed in the above section as well, PRDE reviewed the list of students for who were referred from Part C prior to age 3 between July 1, 2020 and June 30, 2021 to make sure that all students were evaluated, and if determined eligible for Part B, had an IEP developed and implemented, even if late. PRDE verified an evaluation was performed, IEP developed, and IEP implemented, even if late, by looking at student evaluation, IEP, and placement records.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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 | 88.90% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 96.37% | 99.11% | 99.06% | 97.84% | 97.62% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target  | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12,918 | 13,233 | 97.62% | 100% | 97.62% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**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.**

PRDE’s efforts to obtain and validate data for this indicator included the following activities: For FFY 2021, PRDE included the secondary transition checklist as part of the IEP review process for all students age 16 and above within the PRDE special education information system, MiPE. During FFY 2021, the checklist was used for the review of all students age 16 and above as in past years. This was the fifth year during which information was collected through the MiPE system. PRDE SAEE prepared a memorandum that reviewed the instructions for indicator B13 in MiPE. In addition, a user guide for the system was created and published. Monthly follow-up was offered to schools in order to ensure the collection of required data, including the completion of the checklist. Staff involved in this was trained in the use of this checklist in order to assure compliance with the overall process and proper documentation. Special Education School Teachers were in charge of reviewing the files and initially completing the transition checklist for this indicator, in coordination with the SAEE Transition Coordinators. SAEE Transition Coordinators were in charge of training staff and monitoring the use of the checklist. Transition Coordinators are also involved in the IEP development and revision process. In total, PRDE reviewed the files of 13,233 students age 16 and above. The information for this indicator was requested through MiPE in a timely manner in order to verify the data.

| **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 2020**

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

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The PRDE SAEE Monitoring and Compliance Unit (MCU) issued a finding of noncompliance with Indicator 13 to three entities during FFY 2020, and PRDE verified that all three entities corrected the noncompliance within one year of identification.

In verifying correction of noncompliance, PRDE's work has been consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. In making the correction determination, the MCU verified that each entity (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified.

PRDE verified that each entity with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing data subsequently collected during on-site monitoring. Specifically, for each entity at issue, PRDE reviewed a subsequent selection of at least 5 files selected without advance notice of students age 16 and above, and verified that all reviewed IEPs included appropriate measurable post-secondary goals that were updated annually and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet those post-secondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. Also, PRDE reviewed the evidence that the students were invited to the IEP Team meetings where transition services were discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency, as needed, was invited to the IEP Team meetings with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

PRDE reviewed each entity with an Indicator 13 finding of noncompliance and verified that each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified was corrected. For each entity at issue, PRDE reviewed the file of each previously identified finding of noncompliance to verify the correction of each individual case of noncompliance. Specifically, PRDE reviewed those specific files and verified that all reviewed IEPs included appropriate measurable post-secondary goals that were updated annually and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. Also, PRDE reviewed the evidence that the students were invited to the IEP Team meetings where transition services were discussed and evidence that a representative of any participating agency, as needed, was invited to the IEP team meetings with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because PRDE reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, PRDE must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, PRDE must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 SPP/APR, PRDE must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why PRDE did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

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

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

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

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

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

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

**II. *Data Reporting***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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 must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. 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** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 49.20% | 49.40% | 49.60% | 49.80% | 48.50% |
| A | 48.00% | Data | 57.46% | 51.10% | 59.16% | 58.57% | 48.85% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 56.10% | 56.20% | 56.30% | 56.40% | 57.00% |
| B | 55.30% | Data | 69.83% | 65.46% | 68.74% | 68.21% | 68.17% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 85.60% | 86.40% | 87.11% | 87.11% | 81.00% |
| C | 87.10% | Data | 84.58% | 87.37% | 83.82% | 85.66% | 81.12% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 48.70% | 48.90% | 50.10% | 50.30% | 50.50% |
| Target B >= | 58.00% | 58.50% | 59.00% | 59.50% | 60.00% |
| Target C >= | 81.20% | 81.40% | 81.60% | 81.80% | 87.11% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 8,333 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 4,005 |
| Response Rate | 48.06% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 1,950 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 1,433 |
| 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) | 347 |
| 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). | 108 |

| **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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 1,950 | 4,005 | 48.85% | 48.70% | 48.69% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 3,383 | 4,005 | 68.17% | 58.00% | 84.47% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 3,838 | 4,005 | 81.12% | 81.20% | 95.83% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate  | 55.75% | 48.06% |

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

PRDE will closely monitor progress with obtaining responses, assess response rate at regular intervals, and use multiple forms of follow-up in effort to continuously improve the response rate.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

As noted below, PRDE analysis of the response data reflect that the data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school. PRDE analyzed the response rate, and no nonresponse bias was identified.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

PRDE analyzed respondent data and determined the response group was representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school (target population). The response group accurately reflects the target population. For example, the following lists note the make-up of the target population and the representativeness of each response data by (i) race/ethnicity and (ii) disability classification. For each race/ethnicity and disability classification category, the percentage make-up of the target population for that classification is listed followed by the percentage make-up of the response data for that group of responders.

Comparing Target Population % to Response Data % by Race/Ethnicity:
Asian: 0.01%, 0.02%
White, Not Hispanic: 0.06%, 0.05%
Hispanic/Latino: 99.87%, 99.88%
Native American: 0.04%, 0.02%
Black, Not Hispanic: 0.02%, 0.02%

Comparing Target Population % to Response Data % by IDEA Disability Category Classification:
Autism: 3.83%, 4.27%
Deaf-blindness: 0.01%, 0.02%
Emotional Disturbance: 1.91%, 1.52%
Hearing Impairment: 0.56%, 0.55%
Multiple Disabilities: 0.68%, 0.60%
Intellectual Disabilities: 7.44%, 6.62%
Other Health Impairment: 23.46%, 23.608%
Orthopedic Impairment: 0.24%, 0.40%
Specific Learning Disability: 58.73%, 59.65%
Speech or Language Impairment: 2.56%, 1.95%
Traumatic Brain Injury: 0.02%, 0.02%
Visual Impairment: 0.55%, 0.80%

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

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

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

The metric used to determine representativeness was +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

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

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

## 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 and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 712 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 444 |

**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**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 50.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 53.00% | 53.25% | 53.50% | 50.01% | 50.00% |
| Data | 59.00% | 70.82% | 27.78% | 40.48% | 61.48% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 50.10% | 50.00% | 50.30% | 50.40% | 50.50% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 444 | 712 | 61.48% | 50.10% | 62.36% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1 Mediations held | 256 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 206 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

**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**

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 43.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 66.50% | 66.75% | 67.00% | 56.76% | 57.00% |
| Data | 91.61% | 89.70% | 56.76% | 74.24% | 81.60% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 57.10% | 57.20% | 57.30% | 57.40% | 57.50% |

**FFY 2021 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 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 206 | 0 | 256 | 81.60% | 57.10% | 80.47% | 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

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

PRDE’s State Identified Measurable Results (SIMR) criteria is to increase the percentage (%) of special education students in the 5th grade who score proficient or advanced on the math regular assessment in the participating schools (all elementary schools from the former Yabucoa School District). PRDE’s SIMR is aligned in accordance with APR Indicator 3 and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the Puerto Rico Assessment System, called Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico (META-PR).

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

PRDE's theory of action has not changed. A copy of PRDE's Theory of Action is available in the following link: https://compascgcom-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/yayala\_compascg\_com/ETpLBby90XtDr9RYPreVHT8B24zHQm23hevb1KBND070LQ?e=tSff9m

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| FFY 2015 | 27.63% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 27.73% | 27.78% | 27.83% | 27.88% | 27.93% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of students from the SiMR scoring Proficient or Advance** | **Number of participating students** | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 85 | 263 |  | 27.73% | 32.32% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

The data source to be used would come from SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups – Math (EDFacts file spec FS175).

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

PRDE’s SIMR is aligned in accordance with APR Indicator 3 and focuses on improving the performance of students with disabilities on the Puerto Rico Assessment System, called Measurement and Evaluation for Academic Transformation of Puerto Rico (META-PR). Once the assessment is administered, the results are received from the PRDE Planning Office. PRDE Central Level performs its data analysis by identifying the schools within the SiMR, specifically their 5th grade student performance on META-PR in mathematics.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

https://compascgcom-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/yayala\_compascg\_com/Ee0ZhRQXQ8tLk84u9zYYxtsBhB\_Sv9X7Hv376rQiT4F4dg?e=MygJVq

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

As an infrastructure improvement strategy PRDE started implementing Response to Intervention in the 25 schools of the HREO. This is a multilevel system of support for enhancing instruction and improving student outcomes. RTI is driven by individual student needs as determined by ongoing performance and efficient progress-monitoring measures. These measures provide an estimate of students’ response to effective tier 1 instruction. For students who respond less than adequately, increasingly intense instruction is available in tier 2 (small groups support) and tier 3 (individualized support).
RTI implementation status
• 25 schools in the HREO are participating in an RTI professional development program.
• The training program focuses on developing infrastructure to address the technical and academic dimensions of RTI.
• As part of the infrastructure, to implement RTI, schools have been taking workshops and coaching to form RTI’s Leadership Team and RTI Math Teachers Team. The school’s leadership team serves as the site’s guiding coalition for implementing RTI. The teacher teams work together to implement RTI and promote positive student outcomes. Teams of educators meet regularly to analyze student data, create math intervention plans, work on common formative assessments, and how to improve teaching practices using evidence-based strategies.
• At PRDEs central and regional administration level RTI Leadership teams were also formed to support RTI implementation in schools. Members of these teams are being trained on how to implement RTI effectively. High-level officials are engaged in the process of decision-making to implement RTI. These are the important steps to support the multilevel system of support at the school level.
• Students of 70.8% (85/120) of the participating teachers in RTI Professional Development Program are receiving a primary level of prevention through the teaching of a research-based core curriculum in the general education classroom (RTI-Tier 1). Some of the evidence-based teaching strategies they are using are differentiated instruction, flexible grouping, direct /explicit instruction, scaffolding, student feedback, metacognition, data analysis, and common formative assessments, among others. If the primary level of prevention is effective, most students will be able to maintain appropriate progress in math and meet academic benchmarks. However, a percentage of students will likely require a more intense level of instruction and be referred to tier 2 or 3.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

Infrastructure: 25 schools implementing RTI

Short-term outcome:
- Scientifically based classroom instruction
-Differentiated instruction
-Ongoing student assessment.
-RtI Math Teacher Team
-RTI School Leadership team
-RTI Humacao Regional Education Office Leadership Team
-RTI State Level Team

Professional Development:
-RtI workshops tier 1, 2 and 3 for teachers, school personnel, state level staff and Humacao Regional Education Office
-Coaching’s
-Technical Assistance

Measure:
-Team members list
-Attendance sheets
-Pre-post test 32% relative learning gain in workshops
-92% workshop satisfaction
-98% coaching satisfaction

Sustainability Improvement efforts:
- Collaboration among administrative staff, teachers, and parents regarding students’ learning in math
-Early intervention for students who are struggling with math
-Decisions based on objective data (e.g., student progress monitoring data)
- Shared responsibility and increased accountability for student learning
- Instructional decisions guided by progress monitoring data
- Potential reduction of behavior problems
- Greater staff, parent, and student involvement in the educational process

Scale-up:
Next year SSIP will be extended to 15 schools of the San Juan Regional Educational Office, to implement RTI in math.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The 25 Schools that started implementing RTI as tier 1 first steps will move to provide tier 2 and tier 3 interventions next year.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

• Response to intervention
• Professional Learning Communities
• Explicit Instruction
• Differentiated Instruction
• Flexible Grouping
• Active Student Engagement
• Behavior Strategies

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

• Response to intervention is a system that provides a safety net for at-risk students, especially those with learning disabilities. The system monitors how well students respond to research-based instruction. It aims to identify struggling students early on and give them the support they need. The goal is for teachers to intervene before a student fall far behind in math and language.
• Professional Learning Communities: is a model that presents a shift from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning. It provides a systematic process in which teachers work together to analyze and improve learning outcomes for all students.
• Explicit Instruction is a teaching strategy in which math skills are taught from less to more complex using direct, clear, and concise instructional language. This approach is a way to teach in a direct, structured way with emphasis on proceeding in small steps and checking for understanding. It is also engaging, helping to achieve active and successful participation of all students.
• Differentiated Instruction engages each student in active learning according to his/her needs. In this process, lessons are designed to meet student’s interests, needs, and strengths. Teachers personalize learning and can give students a choice in how they learn.
• Flexible Grouping started as a strategy this year in math. This is a combination of the whole group, small group, and individual instruction that helps teachers to create fluid groups that meet the needs of all students. Schools are working to change their master schedule to have 30-minute blocks twice a week for tier 2 interventions and tier 3 will be offered as part of an afterschool support program called Extended Academic Reinforcement.
• Active Student Engagement: ensuring all students are actively involved during instruction. This includes many opportunities to respond, ample time to practice skills, and prompt corrective feedback.
• Behavior Strategies: using metacognitive strategies in math and proactively and explicitly teaching the expected behaviors and routines, and frequent use of reinforcement and praise.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

• Response to intervention helps outcomes for children with disabilities by providing well-designed instruction and intensified interventions in general education. This system identifies students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitors student progress, provides evidence-based interventions, and can help identify students with learning disabilities or other disabilities. RTI also can help schools save special education resources for kids who truly need them.
• Professional learning communities can also help outcomes for children with disabilities by enhancing the communication between the regular classroom teacher and special education teacher. This approach develops teacher leadership focused on building and sustaining school improvement efforts. Teachers enhance their leadership capacity while they work as members of math collaborative teams that focus on improving student learning.
• Explicit Instruction is an educational strategy that has been proven to improve the abilities and outcomes in academics for students with special needs. Students with disabilities are at particular risk for experiencing math calculation difficulties. With the addition of explicit instruction into math curricula, students with special needs can improve their academic abilities. In addition, students can grow not only academically, but also in confidence and appropriate behavior.

• Differentiating Instruction helps all students with disabilities. This teaching method helps bring struggling students up to speed in learning and enables gifted students to learn at a faster pace. When teachers use differentiated instruction, all students are moving toward the same learning objectives, while giving them the freedom to choose how they get there and demonstrate what they’ve learned.

• Flexible grouping helps in teaching diverse learners, which allows the provision of in-class support for students with disabilities. It helps create an inclusive classroom culture that honors learner variability. Teachers use data to put students into small groups for instruction. These groups change frequently in response to the lesson outcome and student needs. It is flexible, as students can be grouped at the same skill level or with varying skill levels. It helps teachers provide the right support, in the right way, at the right time.

• Active Student Engagement (ASE) strategies are very important to help outcomes for children with disabilities because teachers can turn things around for them creating inclusive classroom activities. Educators ensure that all students are actively involved during instruction. These activities allow students with disabilities to bring themselves and their identities into the classroom. ASE is multi-faceted and is often characterized by a behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimension. It is a key element of a positive classroom climate, with research linking it to academic achievement and life outcomes.

• Behavior strategies help ensure that students with disabilities achieve their academic and social goals by encouraging positive conduct in the classroom and other settings. By integrating behavior supports like pre-teaching, and opportunities to respond to instruction, teachers can foster proactive behaviors and reduce the probability that challenging behaviors occur. Also, students with learning disabilities tend to lack the skills to direct their learning so teachers in SSIP are learning to use metacognitive strategies for teaching. Students that learn how to be more metacognitive move from a mindset that leaves little room for change to a mindset that promotes self-awareness, helping them manage their feelings and boost self-esteem. It helps children to adapt to new experiences, challenges, and emotional setbacks.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Considering the technical dimension of RTI, at PRDE we are starting with a more stable implementation of the multilevel system. To monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change, we are training school personnel and staff at the state and regional levels to use an RTI rubric as a guide. Along the way we are adapting the implementation, according to our cultural reality, taking the first steps to start the system in our schools These rubrics from RTI Action Network are available for the classroom, school, and regional office level. Each rubric describes what RTI looks like across its basic components: problem-solving, curriculum & instruction, assessment, leadership, family & community partnering, positive school climate, and across four growth stages: emerging, developing, operationalizing, and optimizing.
The purpose of these rubrics is to:
• serve as an informational resource, and roadmap of RTI implementation
• measure fidelity of RTI implementation
• assist school, regional, or state level personnel with planning for an action plan or school improvement plan
From the academic dimension of RTI, teachers are being trained to collect data to monitor student progress. They measure students’ skills with the diagnostic test, formative, and summative assessments, 10, 20, 30 a 40-week grades, and daily observation, to track how well the child is responding to evidenced-based teaching methods or instructional interventions. Charting progress over time is helping them use data to decide if the student needs to be taught differently. For example, in professional development teachers are learning to work with progress monitoring graphs, that show the student baseline, the goal is working toward, and how the student is doing on every assessment during the intervention period.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

In professional development, we are administering pre-post test and satisfaction surveys, this gives us information about the workshop and coaching quality and how school, regional, and state-level personnel are understanding evidence-based practices relating to RTI. As teachers, we also use an instrument to measure the use of evidence-based strategies in the classroom, to know the level of knowledge transfer applied to teaching.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

• Evidence-based approaches mentioned before are all important to the implementation of RTI. In the next steps, we will continue to offer teachers support with workshops and additional coaching on the topics so that they gain confidence in the implementation of strategies in the classroom. We will put a lot of emphasis on explicit instruction and differentiated instruction, as well as data analysis. We will also go deeper into RTI Tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions.

• From the technical side of RTI, we will also continue to support staff at the educational region and state level, with workshops and coaching, so that they can develop the public policy necessary to support the full implementation of Response to Intervention. We want all levels of the educational system to be trained to contribute, from their role to the success of the RTI implementation. We will achieve this with quality professional development.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.**

For FFY 2022 participating schools will increase for the San Juan Educational Region to 15 additional schools. This will increase the participating schools to a total of 40 schools.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

PRDE solicited broad stakeholder input on PRDE’s targets in the SPP/APR including any subsequent revisions made to those targets and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, Puerto Rico’s State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Our original stakeholder group, called the Comité Consultivo de Educación Especial (“Special Education Advisory Committee”), is responsible for advising PRDE regarding the needs in the education of children with disabilities and for providing assistance and feedback about reports to be submitted to the Federal Government including our SSIP. The group includes representation from various sectors such as: the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), the Puerto Rico Department of the Family, the Puerto Rico Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Puerto Rico Department of Health, Special Education Teachers, School Directors, parents of students with disabilities, SAEE personnel, autism representative, specialists such as a School Psychologist, Occupational Therapist, Speech Pathologist, and adult with impairment, and others. SAEE personnel participate continuously in meetings with the special education stakeholders group.

The members of our stakeholder group also serve as liaisons for initiatives that benefit the special education population and their families. Recommendations provided from the stakeholders were incorporated into PRDE’s FFY 2021 APR. PRDE developed this FFY 2021 SPP/APR with broad stakeholder input. As discussed above, PRDE SAEE held various meetings with the stakeholder group and received their input regarding the SPP/APR, including feedback regarding the individual indicators including FFY 2021 data, targets, any subsequent revisions to targets, and related activities and initiatives as well as the SSIP.

Additional mechanisms through with PRDE solicits broad stakeholder input includes PRDE work with and through the non-profit organization Apoyo a Padres de Niños con Impedimentos (Support for Parents of Students with Disabilities, or APNI by its acronym in Spanish), its operation of Parent Academies on post-secondary topics, and Communities of Learning through its SSIP efforts, among others. APNI’s work helps increase the capacity of parents and serves as an avenue for receiving feedback on improvement activities and related policies. Similarly, the Parent Academies provide capacity building sessions for parents and include feedback sessions where parents provide feedback regarding improvement activities and data and policies related to post-secondary transition. Finally, the communities of learning have been key in providing feedback regarding the Indicator 17 / the SSIP in its entirety and implementation thereof. Through all of these avenues, PRDE seeks and receives stakeholder input that is considered in the development of the SPP/APR including targets, subsequent revisions of targets, and development and implementation of the SSIP (Ind. 17).

The stakeholder input received from the Comite Consultivo de EE was to increase the amount or schools benefiting from the SSIP improvement strategies.

 **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

• To engage stakeholders, we are focusing on professional development, so personnel is well trained. We are communicating the vision and goals of the multi-level system of support.

• We also have an open table approach, as a professional learning community we emphasize the importance of partnering to find solutions and make decisions. We are talking about evidenced-based practices, and procedures in the multilevel system, and how it’s tied to equitable learner outcomes. Also identifying available resources and professional development needed so stakeholders get a deep understanding of opportunities and how to overcome barriers.

• In the workshops and coaching, we are working with role clarity and responsibilities with RTI implementation.

• As part of the workshops, we are suggesting multiple strategies so schools can engage the whole community with RTI implementation. This can be accomplished through virtual events, hosting coffee with the principal events, using physical or virtual comment boxes, encouraging email or phone communication, and using surveys. We emphasize the importance of gathering input from diverse groups of stakeholders who accurately represent the entire school community.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

The Associate Secretary for Special Education has joined forces with the Humacao Regional Office for Education and the Undersecretary for Academic Affairs to address the challenges associated with the implementation of RTI and evidence-based strategies. A professional development plan was designed to address the challenges described and we will continue with dialogue tables to promote communication among the professional learning community, as they find solutions to the challenges in implementation and share threats and best practices.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

Next year we will focus on the scaling up to a new Educational Region. This includes to implement the SSIP from the beginning and provide all the required orientation to Regional Personnel and School Directors to have them engaged in the SSIP implementation.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

We anticipate that as with the schools from the Humacao Region we would have a positive engagement from school administrators. Which we can predict a positive outcome that demonstrates benefits for students in math. the data collection will continue to be our Ed Facts Assessment data.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

The impact on virtual learning during the COVID Pandemic significantly affected the results of students with disabilities in math on the assessment data. The Department of Education of PR established a work plan called "Plan de Recuperacion Academica" which includes after hour school interventions for teachers to support students needs.

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

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 17 - OSEP Response

## 17 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

**Name:**

Daiber N. Carrion

**Title:**

PR Special Education Compliance Officer

**Email:**

carrionmdn@de.pr.gov

**Phone:**

787 380-6997

**Submitted on:**

04/27/23 6:45:15 PM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

**Puerto Rico**

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination[[3]](#footnote-4)**

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 70.63% | Needs Assistance |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 18 | 10 | 55.56% |
| **Compliance** | 14 | 12 | 85.71% |

**2023 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

| **Reading Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 94% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 94% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |

**Math Assessment Elements**

| **Math Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 93% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | 94% | 2 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 5% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 100% | 1 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 1% | 0 |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | 100% | 1 |

**Exiting Data Elements**

| **Exiting Data Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out** | 31 | 0 |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma\*\*** | 62 | 0 |

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

**2023 Part B Compliance Matrix**

| **Part B Compliance Indicator[[4]](#footnote-5)** | **Performance (%)**  | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.** | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation** | 96.81% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday** | 96.03% | YES | 2 |
| **Indicator 13: Secondary transition** | 97.62% | YES | 2 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | 0.00% |  | 0 |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | 99.33% |  | 2 |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 2 |
| **Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | None |  |  |

## Data Rubric

**Puerto Rico**

FFY 2021 APR[[5]](#footnote-6)

|   | **Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3A** | 1 | 1 |
| **3B** | 1 | 1 |
| **3C** | 1 | 1 |
| **3D** | 1 | 1 |
| **4A** | 1 | 1 |
| **4B** | N/A | 0 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | N/A | 0 |
| **10** | N/A | 0 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |
| **12** | 1 | 1 |
| **13** | 1 | 1 |
| **14** | 1 | 1 |
| **15** | 1 | 1 |
| **16** | 1 | 1 |
| **17** | 1 | 1 |
|  | **Subtotal** | 18 |
| **APR Score Calculation** | **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
|  | **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 23 |

|  |  | **618 Data[[6]](#footnote-7)** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/****Ed Envs** **Due Date: 4/6/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal** | 21 |
| **618 Score Calculation** |  |  | **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | 26.00 |

| **Indicator Calculation** |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 23 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 26.00 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 49.00 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 3 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 49.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator\*) = | 1.0000 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 100.00 |

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part B 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 1st Wednesday in April |
| Part B Personnel  | C070, C099, C112 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Discipline  | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | Wednesday in the 3rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date) |
| Part B Dispute Resolution  | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in May |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

## Dispute Resolution



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Percentage blurred due to privacy protection. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B." [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)