

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Florida



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

FLDOE INFORMATION DATABASE: Section 1008.385(2), Florida Statutes, mandates that each school district and the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) develop and implement a comprehensive management information system made up of compatible components and links all levels of the state education system. The automated student information system is the vehicle school districts use to transfer student records using state-defined elements and formats electronically. In contrast, the automated staff information system serves the same purpose for school district personnel.

STATE REPORTING FORMATS AND DATA ELEMENTS: An essential component of the FDOE Information DataBase is the data element. In the automated student information system, there are over 300 data elements. For a complete list of the student database formats and data elements, please refer to the database manuals online <http://fldoe.org/accountability/datasys/database-manuals-updates/>.

SURVEYS: Formats are submitted during scheduled survey periods. Surveys 1-4 are concurrent with the FTE survey weeks specified by the Commissioner of Education. Surveys 1-4 collect data on students in membership and attendance during survey weeks. Survey 5 is used to collect data about all students who were in membership at any time during the school year (end of year information).

OTHER CALCULATION CONSIDERATIONS: Data sets used for purposes of the SPP/APR are typically gathered at a point in time following the state processing but before the final update/amendment date. Because districts may submit changes for a period of time following the survey due date, calculation results will vary depending on when the data are pulled. In some cases, data for determining whether or not a district has met an indicator target may be pulled before the final update/amendment data.

OTHER DATA SOURCES

In addition to the FDOE Information Data Base, other sources of data are used to determine if Florida has met SPP goals. These data sources include:
Bureau of Accountability Reporting assessment results
Parent involvement survey results
Early Childhood outcomes results
60-day timeline data submitted by districts to BEESS
Florida Education Training and Placement Information (FETPIP) files
Florida Department of Health Early Steps program data files

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

76

General Supervision System:

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

Overview:

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE), Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS), Dispute Resolution and Monitoring section, assumes primary responsibility for the exceptional student education (ESE) monitoring and dispute resolution functions for the all state's local educational agencies (LEA).

Monitoring System

BEESS implements a leveled (tiered) system of compliance monitoring. All LEAs participate in an annual desktop monitoring for the compliance process. BEESS verifies some LEAs participate in on-site monitoring and technical assistance visits based, in part, on data gathered through this process.

Desktop Monitoring for compliance (Levels 1 and 2)

The desktop monitoring process comprises primary and focused (Level 1 and Level 2) components to ensure that LEAs comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and state statutes and rules while focusing on student outcomes. The bureau has developed compliance protocols to align with selected indicators using the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Part B SPP/APR Related Requirements document and includes specific standards (i.e., regulatory requirements) OSEP determined to relate most directly to each priority area and indicator under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Florida-specific statutes and rules the protocols, including citations for each standard. Desktop monitoring is the bureau-led process where LEAs review critical components of their ESE programs. LEAs are responsible for completing the protocols and identifying and reporting required corrective actions. The ESE General Supervision Website (GSW) provides information and guidance for these protocols. Corrective action plans and noncompliance findings are also reported and tracked via <https://BESegsw.org/>.

On-Site Monitoring and Technical Assistance (Level 3)

The purposes of the on-site monitoring and technical assistance process include the following:

1. Monitoring the performance of students with disabilities and supporting LEAs in their efforts to improve results supporting LEAs disabilities graduate college and be career-ready by reducing barriers to equity and access.
2. Monitoring compliance with related IDEA regulations and corresponding state rules to include state statutory requirements related to the use of restraint and seclusion.

Criteria for Selection of LEAs:

1. Identification as an LEA that is required to set aside 15 percent of the IDEA, Part B funds for comprehensive early intervening services based on data reflecting significant disproportionality in the categories of discipline, over-identification, or placement.
2. LEA performance regarding:

- a. Percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a standard high school diploma
 - b. Percentage of students with individual educational plans (IEPs) dropping out of high school
 - c. Rates of suspension and expulsion for students with IEPs
 - d. Percentage of students with IEPs served in the regular education environment
 - e. Postsecondary outcomes for students with IEPs
 - f. Percentage of schools identified as underperforming based on Florida's adopted federal indicator calculations for the subgroup of students with disabilities
3. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification
 4. Reported incidents of restraint or seclusion for students with IEPs

Dispute Resolution

The responsibilities and activities of the Dispute Resolution and Monitoring section also include the following: coordination of the review and approval of LEA policies and procedures related to students with disabilities; provision of technical assistance and support to districts related to compliance with state and federal regulations and the districts associated to the education of students with disabilities; facilitation of informal resolution at the local level; provision of state-sponsored mediation; provision of state-sponsored facilitated IEP process; and investigation of formal state complaints and oversight of the IDEA related due process hearing system. Daily, bureau staff responds to parent and stakeholder calls. Everyday correspondence includes concerns associated with the education of children with disabilities and facilitated communication between the parents and the LEAs. Information and resources are also provided to parents and LEAs to assist in the resolution of the issues. When the issues cannot be resolved informally at the local level, parents may request state-sponsored mediation or facilitated IEP team meetings, file a formal state complaint, or request a due process hearing.

Facilitated IEP Team Meetings

Training is provided to IEP participants in all LEAs regarding the facilitated IEP process. LEAs are supported through discretionary projects to offer facilitation at the district level. Facilitation requests are also received and processed by bureau staff for state-sponsored facilitators. State-sponsored facilitators are provided at no cost to the parents or the LEA.

Mediation

Mediation requests are received and processed by bureau staff with contracted mediators. State-sponsored mediation is provided at no cost to the parents or the LEA. Formal complaints are investigated by bureau staff who offer mediation to the complainants and the LEAs as an alternative remedy. If both parties agree to mediation and the extension of the complaint, the complaint investigation is placed in abeyance pending the outcome of the mediation process (which usually takes place within two weeks of the request). If an agreement is reached, the parties execute a legally binding agreement that sets forth the resolution and is signed by both parties. The written, signed mediation agreement is enforceable in state or U.S. LEA court.

State Complaint

For formal complaints that proceed to full investigation, both parties are provided an opportunity to submit documentation regarding the complainant's allegations and the LEA's response. Following FDOE's review of documentation and other inquiry activities which may include interviews, records reviews or on-site visits, a report is issued within 60 days of the full filing per federal law with findings of fact, conclusions, reasons for the decision and recommendations, required actions or corrective actions, as appropriate. A due process hearing may be requested in addition to a request for mediation or the filing of a formal complaint. If all three are requested, the mediation occurs first (if both parties agree to mediate). If the complaint issues are the same as the issues to be addressed in the due process hearing, the complaint inquiry is placed in abeyance pending the outcome of the due process hearing. If there are issues in the complaint that are not a part of the due process hearing, investigation of these issues proceed during the time that the due process hearing is pending. Complaint issues that were part of the due process complaint that are not addressed during due process may be investigated following the completion of the due process hearing.

Due Process Hearings

Due process hearing requests are submitted by parents to the LEA and forwarded to the Division of Administrative Hearings (DOAH), the agency that conducts the hearings. Administrative law judges (ALJs), employed by DOAH and provided training by the FDOE, make decisions regarding the cases and provide information to the bureau. FDOE maintains the records following completion of the cases and provides oversight for the system (i.e., timelines, orders review, and ALJs training). Data related to the corrective actions identified through complaints the bureau maintains data associated with the corrective actions identified through complaints and due process.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/dispute-resolution.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The bureau implements a comprehensive, overarching framework for effectively supporting LEAs based on evidence of need. Implementing this framework requires ongoing, continuous improvement effort using the systematic change process over time. The bureau works directly with LEA leadership to impact change at the school level. The ultimate indicators of success are student levels of performance targeted by the SPP and improved rates of compliance. The primary student population is general education students who have been identified as students with disabilities entitling them to additional supports and services in accordance with the IDEA.

The bureau currently offers a continuum of supports to LEAs designed to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, as evidenced by increased performance on SPP indicators and increased compliance rates. The following list of examples conveys the current universal, supplemental, and intensive supports provided by the bureau, which is updated based on evaluation of effectiveness over time.

Universal Supports - General, statewide support designed to inform, assist and improve results for all LEAs includes:

- Web-available resources via the department, bureau and discretionary projects
- ESE Policies and Procedures process
- Technical assistance offered in multiple formats including presentations, publications and professional development
- Various bureau-hosted presentations (e.g., Administrators' Management Meeting [AMM], and the Council of Administrators of Special Education [CASE])
- Discretionary project administration (e.g., liaisons, project tracking system [PTS], calls and meetings)
- Web based and on-demand professional development through a bureau supported, web-based
- LEA profiles
- Family and community engagement efforts
- Florida's Differentiated Monitoring System specific to students with disabilities
- ESE General Supervision Website (GSW) <https://BESEgsu.org/>
- Collaboration with pertinent state and national groups

Supplemental Supports - More focused, targeted, frequent support in addition to and aligned with universal supports that are provided to subgroups of LEAs in response to identified needs include:

- Targeted assistance in specific indicators from bureau indicator teams
- Targeted size-alike and issue-alike problem-solving groups
- Targeted attention and assistance from discretionary projects (by LEA/school request)
- Daily and timely communication and outreach with families, LEAs, schools, and organizations
- Program-area staff specialization and regular LEA-contact calls

Intensive Supports - Most focused, targeted, frequent support in addition to and aligned with universal supports that are provided to individual LEAs in response to identified needs include:

- Individualized, targeted assistance (e.g., specific indicator support from bureau indicator teams)
- Individualized, targeted attention and assistance from discretionary projects
- Level 3 on-site monitoring visits and required corrective actions
- State complaint procedures, including required corrective actions

Professional Development System:

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

The State has multiple mechanisms to ensure timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based professional development and support to LEAs. These mechanism include

1. Strategic plan teams focused on specific needs based on SPP APR data who provide in-person and online professional development through bureau staff, discretionary projects, and other professionals.
2. Multiple discretionary projects who provided web-based, virtual and in-person professional development to support efforts that include
 - a. prekindergarten program effectiveness, program quality, inclusion, evaluation and assessment, curriculum and instruction, transition, child outcome measurement, family involvement, and Child, Find awareness and outreach;
 - b. multiple in-person and virtual training to meet LEA needs pertaining to parent involvement.
 - c. Collaborative efforts with Key2Ed and the discretionary project, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS), to provide professional development regarding the facilitated IEP process to all LEAs. The purpose of this training is to provide LEA staff with the skills needed to facilitate IEP meetings that result in productive collaboration between parents and school staff.
 - d. In person and virtual bureau-hosted meetings including the annual Administrators Management Meeting (AMM) which was most recently held in December of 2021 and featured many federal technical assistance centers presenting in partnership with bureau staff.

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).

The development of Florida's SPP is the responsibility of strategic plan teams and overseen by the bureau. Each team includes individuals with expertise pertinent to the indicator, including staff from the FDOE, staff from discretionary projects (including LEA-level and school-level representation), and individuals from other agencies. The strategic plan leads worked with their team members to review data and set each indicator's targets, which was reviewed by the department for initial pre-approval. The proposed targets were then posted publicly in multiple venues (including the Florida Administrative Registry (FAR) on January 11, 2022 and on the department's webpage) and shared with multiple stakeholders including discretionary projects, ESE Directors for all LEAs and the department's State Advisory Panel. Stakeholder feedback was sought via a widely disseminated survey.

On January 25, 2022, the survey was closed. A review of the data from this indicated stakeholders approval for all proposed indicator targets.

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

NO

Number of Parent Members:

1,680

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.

BEES staff engaged members of the State Advisory Panel (SAP), parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. This engagement occurred through the applicable survey mentioned in this document's Broad Stakeholder Input section. Florida's State Advisory Panel convened on January 21, 2022 where the panel was provided an opportunity to ask questions and share feedback on these targets.

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.

In order to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support implementation activities, the bureau shared the publicly posted proposed targets with parent center staff and LEAs and held meetings to plan, with their assistance, in widely disseminating the survey as well as in reviewing interim data specific to representativeness for stakeholder responses to increase the feedback from a diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. The bureau also supports an integrated stakeholder response system, in collaboration with its discretionary projects, a goal of which is to increase opportunity for feedback in the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

During the January 21st meeting with SAP, all Part B Indicators were presented and explained. To supplement the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR Indicator Card presentation: https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2020-10/58103_IDC_LmntdCrds.pdf was provided to the group and accompanied by the FFY 2020-25 Part B SPP/APR Changes at a Glance document: https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2020-10/58103_IDC_LmntdCrds.pdf document.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

July 2, 2021- The BEESS Strategic Plan Team met and discussed the Part B SPP/APR Indicators changes.

July 27, 2021- The Strategic Team met and discussed the timeline for submitting targets.

October 29, 2021- Targets compiled, Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Proposed Target Draft developed.

October 30, 2021- Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Proposed Target Draft began routing within the department for review

December 10, 2021 - EMAPS is updated and opened to SEAs.

December 15, 2022 - BESE and IDEA Data Center staff present information on FFY 2020-2025 Part B indicators (i.e., measurement procedures, data sources, implementation of the data) at the Administrator's Management Meeting (AMM) in Orlando, Florida to over 400 attendees

January 11, 2022

Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Proposed Target Draft submitted to FDOE Communications Office and approved.

Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Proposed Target Draft submitted to FDOE Chief of Staff Office and approved.

FDOE Senior Chancellor and BEESS Bureau Chief sent emails to all School District Superintendents and School District ESE Directors.

Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Proposed Target Draft is posted to: <https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/>. Part B

FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Indicator Targets- Stakeholder Feedback Survey opens for public input and is posted

<https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/>

January 11th -25th, 2022

Districts posted information on their websites.

Stakeholders access the Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Indicator Targets- Stakeholder Feedback Survey and provide input on proposed targets.

January 21, 2022-

SAP virtual meeting

January 25, 2022

BEESS and Accountability Research and Measurement staff meet to validate indicator 3A-3D data.

Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Indicator Targets- Stakeholder Feedback Survey closed.

January 26, 2022-

Part B FFY 2020-2025 State Performance Plan Indicator Targets- Stakeholder Feedback Survey data, including representativeness data, is analyzed by BEESS staff.

Senior Chancellor and Deputy Chancellor are provided a data summary of the survey results.

BEESS received approval for the proposed targets as the final targets for the FFY 2020 Part B SPP/APR Submission due February 1, 2022.

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.

January 27, 2022-

FFY 2020-2025 Part B SPP/APR targets posted to <https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/>

In addition to publicly posting these results to the website, the department plans to share the results of the target setting, data analysis (including representativeness data), development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation in multiple ways, including

- at the next scheduled State Advisory Panel Meeting in the spring of 2022

- via email to ESE Directors, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees in February of 2022.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

Within 120 days following Florida's submission of the APR, LEA performance reports will be produced and posted on the FDOE website. The LEA Performance Reports are intended to be used as a tool for planning systemic improvement in exceptional education programs. The profiles contain information about state-level targets from Florida's SPP/APR, LEA performance on the indicators and whether the LEA met each state's targets. The state publicly reports on the bureau's website on the FFY 2018 (July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the state on the targets in the state's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, at the following location: <https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>. The reports are listed under the SEA/LEA Profiles and LEA Performance Reports heading.

Historical assessment participation and proficiency are posted online for years when assessments are administered at

<https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>. Additional data including assessment participation and ability are also available via FDOE's Business Intelligence and Reporting Tool; Florida PK-20 Education Information Portal at <https://edstats.fldoe.org/> as well as Florida's know your schools portal, located at: <https://eddata.fldoe.org/>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

While the State has described the mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR, any subsequent revisions that the State made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, that description does not contain the required information. Specifically, the State did not report a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. The State has indicated the description of of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents.

OSEP issued a monitoring report to the State on December 18, 2020 and is currently reviewing the State's response submitted on January 25, 2022, and will respond under separate cover.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe 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), including a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	44.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	56.30%	58.30%	60.30%	62.30%	70.00%
Data	56.80%	61.55%	66.00%	77.41%	81.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	82.30%	82.30%	82.50%	83.00%	83.00%	83.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team, both of which were formed and are supported by the bureau. The input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to transition indicators, including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance, and post-school outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout rate, and postschool outcomes are also examined to provide additional information on how the state and each district are performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in setting targets, where appropriate, and the development of relevant activities to improve results in these areas.

In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of bureau staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the members of SSTIC included representatives from the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Family Network on Disabilities
- Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology (FAAST)
- Florida College System
- Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities
- Florida Center Students with Unique Abilities (FCSUA)
- Florida Department of Children and Families
- Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach
- Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Division of Blind Services
- FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
- FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- FDOE Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention
- Florida Department of Transportation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)
- Florida Youth Council

- Institute for Small and Rural Districts
- Learning Disabilities Association of Florida
- Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System
- The Able Trust

The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team included representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
 - Florida College System
- FDOE of Dropout Prevention
- FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
- FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)
- FDLRS
- Resource Materials and Technology Center: Deaf/Hard of Hearing (RMTC-DHH)
- SEDNET
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System

This team closely examined appropriate data, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity and primary exceptionalism, as they developed the strategic plan. The target for Indicator 1 was set based on the annual graduation rate target under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

One thousand seven hundred thirty individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 1. Of those 170 (9.83%) responses indicated the targets were too high, 408 (23.58%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 1152 (66.59%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	22,703
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	405
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,412

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
22,703	25,520	81.00%	82.30%	88.96%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

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

As outlined in Section 1003.4282, Florida Statutes, to earn a standard diploma in Florida for the cohort of students who graduated in 2020 include the following course, credit, and assessment requirements as follows:

- Four credits in English/English language arts (ELA). To graduate with a standard high school diploma, a student must pass the statewide, standardized grade 10 Reading assessment or earn a concordant score.
- Four credits in mathematics, which must include Algebra 1 and Geometry. The statewide, standardized Algebra 1 end-of-course (EOC) assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade. A student must pass the Algebra 1 end-of-course (EOC) assessment or earn a concordant score for graduation with a standard high school diploma. A student who earns an industry certification for a statewide college credit articulation agreement approved by the State Board of Education may substitute the certification for one mathematics credit. Substitution may occur for two mathematics credits, except for Algebra 1 and Geometry.
- Three credits in science, two of which must have a laboratory component. A student who takes Biology 1 must take the statewide, standardized Biology 1 EOC assessment, and the Biology 1 EOC assessment constitutes 30 percent of the final course grade. A student who earns an industry certification for which the State Board approves a statewide college credit articulation agreement of education may substitute the certification for one science credit, except for Biology 1.
- Three credits in social studies, of which one credit in World History, one credit in United States History, one-half credit in United States Government,

and one-half credit in economics are required. A student who takes United States History must take the statewide, standardized United States History EOC assessment; the student's performance on the assessment constitutes 30 percent of the student's final course grade.

e. One credit in fine or performing arts, speech, debate, or practical arts.

f. One credit in physical education.

g. Eight credits in electives.

Students may also earn a standard high school diploma using an 18-credit-hour option, which includes all of the above, except physical education, which is not required and requires three electives instead of eight.

A waiver of standardized assessment results may be granted by the IEP team to a student with a disability, as provided by Section 1008.22(3) (c), Florida Statutes. For a student to be considered for a statewide, standardized assessment results waiver, the following criteria must be met:

1. The student must be identified as a student with a disability, as defined in s. 1007.02, F.S.: The term "student with a disability" means a student who is documented as having an intellectual disability; a hearing impairment, including deafness; a speech or language impairment; a visual impairment, including blindness; an emotional or behavioral disability; an orthopedic or other health impairment; an autism spectrum disorder; a traumatic brain injury; or a specific learning disability, including, but not limited to, dyslexia, dyscalculia, or developmental aphasia.

2. The student must have an individual educational plan (IEP).

3. The student must have taken the statewide, standardized assessment with appropriate allowable accommodations at least once.

4. Per s. 1008.22(3) (c) 2, F.S., the IEP team must decide whether a statewide, standardized assessment accurately measures the student's abilities, considering all allowable accommodations for students with disabilities. The waiver does not change the standards or requirements a student with a disability must meet to graduate. The waiver is only to be utilized by students with disabilities with extenuating circumstances determined by the IEP team when granted and is not used by the majority of students with disabilities in the state.

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

YES

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

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet. Students with disabilities must meet the exact requirements of all students to graduate. However, for students with disabilities who have taken the statewide standardized assessment with allowable accommodations at least once and have not earned the required score necessary for graduation, the assessment results may be waived. A waiver of standardized assessment results may be granted by the IEP team to a student with a disability, as provided by Section 1008.22(3)(c), Florida Statutes. For a student to be considered for a statewide, standardized assessment results waiver, The results must meet the following criteria:

1. The student must be identified as a student with a disability, as defined in s. 1007.02, F.S.: The term "student with a disability" means a student who is documented as having an intellectual disability; a hearing impairment, including deafness; a speech or language impairment; a visual impairment, including blindness; an emotional or behavioral disability; an orthopedic or other health impairment; an autism spectrum disorder; a traumatic brain injury; or a specific learning disability, including, but not limited to, dyslexia, dyscalculia, or developmental aphasia.

2. The student must have an individual educational plan (IEP).

3. The student must have taken the statewide, standardized assessment with appropriate allowable accommodations at least once.

4. Per s. 1008.22(3)(c)2., F.S., the IEP team must decide whether a statewide, standardized assessment accurately measures the student's abilities, considering all allowable accommodations for students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2011, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State is required to revise its baseline data using data reported under IDEA Section 618, consistent with the measurement table. The FFY 2011 data the State provided is not IDEA Section 618 data.

OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end target for FFY 2025 reflects improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above.

1 - Required Actions

The State did not provide baseline data, as required by the measurement table. The State must report baseline data, using data from IDEA Section 618, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State did not provide targets, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

OPTION 1:

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

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	20.35%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	15.10%	13.40%	11.70%	10.00%	9.50%
Data	18.72%	17.33%	15.86%	12.98%	9.86%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	11.90%	11.90%	11.50%	11.00%	10.50%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, BESE also received stakeholder input for this indicator from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team and are supported by the bureau. The input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to transition indicators, including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance, and post-school outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout rate, and postschool outcomes are also examined to provide additional information on how the state and each district are performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The

stakeholder groups assisted in setting targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results in these areas. In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of bureau staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the members of SSTIC included representatives from the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Family Network on Disabilities
- Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology (FAAST)
- Florida College System
- Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities
- Florida Center Students with Unique Abilities (FCSUA)
- Florida Department of Children and Families
- Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach
- Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Division of Blind Services
- FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
- FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- FDOE Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention
- Florida Department of Transportation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)
- Florida Youth Council
- Institute for Small and Rural Districts
- Learning Disabilities Association of Florida
- Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System
- The Able Trust
- The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team included representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:
 - Agency for Persons with Disabilities
 - Florida College System
 - FDOE of Dropout Prevention
 - FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
 - FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
 - Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
 - Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)
 - FDLRS
 - Resource Materials and Technology Center: Deaf/Hard of Hearing (RMTC-DHH)
 - SEDNET
 - Project 10: Transition Education Network
 - State University System

This team closely examined appropriate data, including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity and primary exceptionalism, as they developed the strategic plan. The target for Indicator 1 was set based on the annual graduation rate target under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

One thousand five hundred fifty-eight individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 2. Of those, 235 (15.08%) responses indicated the targets were too high, 493 (31.64%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 830 (53.27%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	22,703
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	405
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,412

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,412	25,520	9.86%	11.90%	9.45%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Below are the exit codes and definitions for a dropout as provided in our SEA database manuals. All LEAs submit these codes electronically into Florida's Student Information System:

1. DNE: Any student expected to attend a school but did not enter as expected for unknown reasons and required documented efforts to locate the student are maintained per s. 1003.26, Florida Statutes.
2. W05: Any student age 16 or older who leaves school voluntarily with no intention of returning and has filed a formal declaration of intent to terminate school enrollment per s. 1003.21, Florida Statutes.
3. W13: Any student withdrawn from school due to court action. (Does not apply to DJJ students).
4. W15: Any student withdrawn from school due to nonattendance after all procedures outlined in sections 1003.26 and 1003.27, Florida Statutes, have been followed.
5. W18: Any student withdrawn from school due to medical reasons and is unable to receive educational services, such as those provided through the hospital/homebound program.
6. W21: Any student withdrawn from school due to being expelled with no educational services.
7. W22: Any student whose whereabouts are unknown and required documented efforts to locate the student are maintained per s.1003.26, Florida Statutes.
8. W23: Any student withdrawn from school for any other reason than those listed above.

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

N/A

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	92.76%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	85.58%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	81.64%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	93.77%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	86.49%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	80.71%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	85.58%	85.90%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	85.58%	85.58%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	81.64%	81.64%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	86.10%	86.10%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	86.10%	86.10%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	80.71%	80.71%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Representation from the Florida Department of Education participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Just Read, Florida!, the Bureau of Exceptional Student Education and the Office of Early Learning.

Representation from the Florida Department of Education discretionary projects participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Problem Solving/Response to Intervention, Problem Solving/Response to Intervention: Technology and Learning Connections, Regional Educational Laboratories, Resource Materials and Technology Center for the Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Learning Ally, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System.

Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Standards and Instructional Supports and the Bureau of Exceptional Student Education; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System, State Personnel Development Grant Strategic Instruction Model, school district Local Educational agency representatives; are all on the math strategic advisement team.

Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Exceptional Student Education; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Florida Inclusion Network, Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention-Technology & Learning Connections, and Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System are all on the Access-Best Practice for Standards-Based Instructional Support advisement team.

1,071 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 3A. Of those 73 (6.82%) responses indicated the targets were too high, 338 (31.58%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 660 (61.62%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	37,989	29,954	57,817
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	32,165	8,794	23,089
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	102	14,034	18,755
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2,970	2,808	5,359

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	37,813	31,073	55,027
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	32,382	9,917	24,430
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	97	14,143	14,570
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	2,979	2,814	5,415

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	35,237	37,989		85.58%	92.76%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	25,636	29,954		85.58%	85.58%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	47,203	57,817		81.64%	81.64%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	35,458	37,813		86.10%	93.77%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	26,874	31,073		86.10%	86.49%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	44,415	55,027		80.71%	80.71%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

To access the public posting of data and information specific to assessment participation and performance of all students and student subgroups, including students with disability, in addition to other data by state, district and schools please go to the following link:
<https://edudata.fldoe.org/ReportCards/Schools.html?school=0000&district=00>

For other data, including data on students testing with accommodations, please see ESE Databooks by year located at the following link:
<https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator. OSEP accepts the targets for FFYs 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025. OSEP notes that, for the 2020-2021 school year, the State received, from the Department’s Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, a waiver of accountability and school identification requirements in sections 1111(c)(4) and 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), including a waiver of the requirement that the Academic Achievement indicator be adjusted to account for a participation rate below 95 percent, based on the State’s data from the 2020-2021 school year. However, for FFY 2021, OSEP cannot accept the targets because OSEP is concerned that targets below 95% are not consistent with the requirement in ESEA section 1111(c)(4) to annually measure the achievement of not less than 95 percent of all students, and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students, who are enrolled in public schools on the State’s assessments. Further, ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(i)(II) requires that a State’s assessments be administered to all public elementary and secondary school students in the State. The State must revise its targets for FFY 2021 to align with ESEA requirements, solicit stakeholder input on the State’s targets, and report the revised targets in the State’s FFY 2021 SPP/APR due February 1, 2023.

3A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must revise its targets for FFY 2021 to align with ESEA requirements, solicit stakeholder input on the State’s targets, and report the revised targets.

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	22.82%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	16.15%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	15.10%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	28.08%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	22.01%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	14.03%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	22.80%	22.80%	24.00%	26.00%	27.00%	27.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	16.15%	16.15%	20.00%	21.50%	22.00%	22.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	15.10%	15.10%	18.00%	20.00%	21.50%	21.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	28.08%	28.08%	29.00%	30.50%	31.00%	31.50%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	22.01%	22.01%	24.00%	26.50%	27.00%	27.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	14.03%	14.03%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%	21.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Representation from the Florida Department of Education participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Just Read, Florida!, the Bureau of Exceptional Student Education, and the Office of Early Learning.

Representation from the Florida Department of Education discretionary projects participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Problem Solving/Response to Intervention, Problem Solving/Response to Intervention: Technology and Learning Connections, Regional Educational Laboratories, Resource Materials, and Technology Center for the Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Learning Ally, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System.

Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Standards and Instructional Supports and the Bureau of Exceptional Student Education; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System, State Personnel Development Grant Strategic Instruction Model, school district Local Educational agency representatives; are all on the math strategic advisement team.

Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Exceptional Student Education; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Florida Inclusion Network, Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention-Technology & Learning Connections, and Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System are all on the Access-Best Practice for Standards-Based Instructional Support advisement team.

One thousand fifty-nine individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 3B. Of those, 260 (24.55%) responses indicated the targets were too high, 135 (12.75%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 664 (62.70%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	32,267	22,828	41,844
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	7,338	2,126	4,245
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	25	1,560	2,074

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	32,479	24,060	39,000
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9,089	2,925	3,676
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	31	2,371	1,794

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7,363	32,267		22.80%	22.82%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	3,686	22,828		16.15%	16.15%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	6,319	41,844		15.10%	15.10%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9,120	32,479		28.08%	28.08%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	5,296	24,060		22.01%	22.01%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	5,470	39,000		14.03%	14.03%	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.

To access the public posting of data and information specific to assessment participation and performance of all students and student subgroups, including students with disability, in addition to other data by state, district and schools please go to the following link:
<https://edudata.fldoe.org/ReportCards/Schools.html?school=0000&district=00>

For other data, including data on students testing with accommodations, please see ESE Databooks by year located at the following link:
<https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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

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

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	56.53%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	58.33%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	60.98%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	55.96%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	62.05%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	62.46%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	56.50%	56.50%	57.00%	57.00%	57.50%	57.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	58.30%	58.35%	58.50%	58.50%	59.00%	59.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	60.00%	61.00%	61.50%	61.50%	62.00%	62.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	55.00%	56.00%	56.50%	56.50%	57.00%	57.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	62.00%	62.10%	62.50%	62.50%	63.00%	63.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	63.00%	63.50%	63.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Representation from the Florida Department of Education participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Just Read, Florida!, the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, and the Office of Early Learning

Representation from the Florida Department of Education discretionary projects participating on the ELA strategic advisement team to include: Problem Solving/Response to Intervention, Problem Solving/Response to Intervention: Technology and Learning Connections, Regional Educational Laboratories, Resource Materials, and Technology Center for the Deaf/Hard of Hearing, Learning Ally, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System

Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Standards and Instructional Supports and the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention, Florida Inclusion Network, Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System, State Personnel Development Grant Strategic Instruction Model, school district Local Educational agency representatives; are all on the math strategic advisement team.

Representation from the Florida Department of Education Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services; Florida Department of Education discretionary projects: Florida Inclusion Network, Problem Solving/ Response to Intervention-Technology & Learning Connections, and Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System are all on the Access-Best Practice for Standards-Based Instructional Support advisement team.

One thousand forty-six individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 3C. Of those, 222 (21.22%) responses indicated the targets were too high, 118 (11.28%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 706 (67.50%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	2,970	2,808	5,359
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1,679	1,638	3,268

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	2,979	2,814	5,415
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	1,667	1,746	3,382

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,679	2,970		56.50%	56.53%	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,638	2,808		58.30%	58.33%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,268	5,359		60.00%	60.98%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,667	2,979		55.00%	55.96%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,746	2,814		62.00%	62.05%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3,382	5,415		62.00%	62.46%	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.

To access the public posting of data and information specific to assessment participation and performance of all students and student subgroups, including students with disability, in addition to other data by state, district and schools please go to the following link:
<https://edudata.fldoe.org/ReportCards/Schools.html?school=0000&district=00>

For other data, including data on students testing with accommodations, please see ESE Databooks by year located at the following link:
<https://www.fldoe.org/academics/exceptional-student-edu/data/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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

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

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	29.57
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	36.43
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	35.23
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	25.04
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	31.81
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	20.01

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	29.57	29.57	29.50	28.00	27.00	26.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	36.43	36.43	36.40	35.00	32.00	31.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	35.23	35.23	35.20	34.00	32.00	30.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	25.04	25.04	25.00	24.00	24.00	22.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	31.81	31.81	31.80	31.00	30.00	27.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	20.01	20.01	20.00	19.00	16.00	14.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

One thousand twenty-nine individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 3D. Of those, 216 (20.99%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 154 (14.97%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 659 (64.04%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	199,620	195,248	379,810
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	32,267	22,828	41,844
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	104,539	100,565	188,468
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	48	2,095	2,696
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	7,338	2,126	4,245
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	25	1,560	2,074

Data Source:

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

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	199,359	219,256	277,141
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	32,479	24,060	39,000
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	105,855	115,012	92,218
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	50	2,998	2,096
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9,089	2,925	3,676
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	31	2,371	1,794

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	22.82%	52.39%		29.57	29.57	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	16.15%	52.58%		36.43	36.43	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	15.10%	50.33%		35.23	35.23	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	28.08%	53.12%		25.04	25.04	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	22.01%	53.82%		31.81	31.81	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	14.03%	34.03%		20.01	20.01	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	19.40%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	7.00%	4.00%	2.00%	5.00%	4.00%
Data	11.11%	9.30%	7.69%	11.90%	9.30%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	12.90%	10.00%	9.00%	9.00%	8.50%	8.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Nine hundred twenty-three individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 4A. Of those, 129 (13.98%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 196 (21.24%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 598 (64.79%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

In addition to survey feedback, input was collected from emotional/behavioral disability (E/BD) contacts from each district. Input was also collected from the parents and guardians of students with or at-risk of E/BD and the Positive Behavior/Student Engagement strategic plan workgroup. All stakeholders agreed that the targets were appropriate.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

45

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4	31	9.30%	12.90%	12.90%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The significant discrepancy for indicator 4A is defined as a rate ratio of three or higher when comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities within the local educational agency. Districts are excluded from the calculation when fewer than ten students with disabilities are suspended/expelled for more than ten days.

Numerator = rate for students with disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than ten days (students with disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than ten cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of all students with disabilities) x 100.

Denominator = rate for students without disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than ten days (all students without disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than ten cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of all non-disabled students) x 100.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

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

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

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

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/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.

51

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	25	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The significant discrepancy for indicator 4B is defined as a rate ratio of three or higher for a specific racial/ethnic group when comparing students with disabilities to students without disabilities within the local educational agency. Districts included in the calculation consist of every race that meets the n-size, which is more than 10 days.

Numerator = rate for students with disabilities being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (for instance, Hispanic students who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment for all Hispanic students with disabilities) x 100.

Denominator = rate for students without disabilities of being suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (for instance, all students without disabilities who were suspended/expelled for more than 10 cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment for all non-disabled students) x 100.

There was a total 76 districts included in this data. There were 51 districts excluded because they did not meet the minimum n-size. Therefore, 25 districts were included in the calculation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

902 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 4B. Of those 98 (10.86%) responses indicated the targets were too high, 32 (3.55%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 830 (53.27%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

B. Percent of districts that have (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs

and (b) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Data lag one year (2018-19 rates of suspension/expulsion will be used for the SPP/APR due February 1, 2021).

SOURCE

EDFacts file 006 compiled by PERA from Survey 5 of a given school year. (PERA 3509). Ages 3-21

TIMEFRAME FOR DATA RETRIEVAL

Districts submitted 2018-19 data in survey 5. BEESS retrieved data for reports following state processing before the final update/amendment date. PERA pulled these data and generated the discipline reports based upon the preliminary data submitted on October 4, 2019. BEESS used this file to produce the discipline reports for Indicator 4.

CALCULATION METHOD FOR 4A

A district with a significant discrepancy will have a rate ratio equal to or greater than 3.0.

Numerator = the number of students with disabilities suspended out-of-school/expelled for more than 10 days cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of disabled students) × 100

Denominator = the number of non-disabled students being suspended out-of-school/expelled for more than Ten cumulative days divided by the total year enrollment of non-disabled students) × 100

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2005	Target >=	79.00%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%
A	54.40%	Data	73.02%	73.90%	75.27%	76.20%	76.73%
B	2005	Target <=	9.00%	8.00%	7.00%	6.00%	6.00%
B	23.20%	Data	13.91%	13.77%	13.79%	13.52%	13.35%
C	2005	Target <=	1.75%	1.50%	1.25%	1.00%	1.00%
C	3.00%	Data	3.84%	3.79%	3.26%	3.38%	3.23%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	76.73%	77.69%	77.70%	78.00%	78.50%	78.60%
Target B <=	13.35%	13.35%	13.20%	12.90%	12.80%	12.70%
Target C <=	3.23%	3.23%	3.00%	2.90%	2.80%	2.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The strategic plan team analyzed data regarding districts' identified priorities on their required Best Practices for Inclusive Education (BPIE) self-assessment. Team members also reviewed state- and district-level data related to inclusion concerning disability type, age, district, and transitions from elementary to secondary settings. It is important to note that the indicators are also examined to provide additional information on how the state and each district are performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida's multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in setting targets, where appropriate, and developing appropriate activities to improve results in these areas.

The Best Practices for Inclusion Strategic Planning Team includes representation from the bureau and the following partner organizations:

- Florida Inclusion Network (FIN)
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)
- Resource Materials and Technology Center for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (RMTD-D/HH)
- Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)
- Center for Autism & Related Disabilities (CARD)
- Project Access Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities Network (SEDNET)

Eight hundred twenty-eight individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 5. Of those 125 (15.10%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 119 (14.37%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 828 (70.53%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

Eight hundred thirteen individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 5B. Of those, 145 (17.84%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 85 (10.46%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 583 (71.71%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate. Eight hundred twelve individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 5C. Of those 121 (14.90%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 77 (9.48%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 614 (75.62%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	388,593
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	299,125
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	50,827
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	9,486
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	469
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	2,112

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	299,125	388,593	76.73%	76.73%	76.98%	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	50,827	388,593	13.35%	13.35%	13.08%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	12,067	388,593	3.23%	3.23%	3.11%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	38.00%	43.00%	48.00%	50.00%	50.50%
A	Data	35.83%	36.73%	40.09%	39.23%	39.25%
B	Target <=	48.30%	47.30%	46.30%	45.30%	44.80%
B	Data	49.54%	49.82%	48.54%	46.90%	47.63%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

720 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 6A. Of those 186 (25.83%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 48 (6.67%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 486 (67.50%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

707 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 6B. Of those 71 (10.04%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 130 (18.39%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 506 (71.57%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

701 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 6C. Of those 117 (16.69%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 36 (5.14%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 548 (78.17%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

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	2020	25.93%
B	2020	60.84%
C	2020	0.38%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	25.93%	25.93%	26.00%	26.30%	26.50%	26.50%
Target B <=	60.84%	60.84%	60.83%	60.82%	60.81%	60.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.38%	0.38%	0.38%	0.37%	0.36%	0.36%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

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

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	6,304	12,183	2,177	20,664
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	1,123	3,546	690	5,359
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	4,182	6,730	1,116	12,028
b2. Number of children attending separate school	176	294	74	544
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	32	35	11	78

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	5,359	20,664	39.25%	25.93%	25.93%	N/A	N/A

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	12,572	20,664	47.63%	60.84%	60.84%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	78	20,664		0.38%	0.38%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State revised the baseline for Indicator 6A and 6B, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State established baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

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

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2008	Target >=	66.10%	68.10%	70.60%	73.60%	75.10%
A1	65.90%	Data	66.66%	69.12%	71.25%	74.46%	75.34%
A2	2008	Target >=	83.40%	83.90%	84.40%	84.90%	85.40%

A2	75.80%	Data	81.10%	81.60%	80.42%	77.64%	69.76%
B1	2008	Target >=	66.40%	68.40%	70.90%	73.90%	74.40%
B1	58.80%	Data	63.16%	65.02%	65.32%	66.55%	60.19%
B2	2008	Target >=	71.40%	73.40%	75.90%	78.90%	79.40%
B2	52.90%	Data	66.49%	67.22%	66.38%	64.63%	51.80%
C1	2008	Target >=	57.90%	59.90%	62.40%	65.40%	67.40%
C1	59.50%	Data	56.84%	61.42%	64.11%	65.69%	64.61%
C2	2008	Target >=	80.50%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%
C2	73.30%	Data	77.22%	78.42%	78.14%	76.91%	68.28%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	75.30%	75.30%	75.50%	75.50%	75.60%	75.60%
Target A2 >=	69.80%	69.80%	69.90%	69.90%	70.00%	70.00%
Target B1 >=	60.20%	60.20%	60.50%	60.50%	61.00%	61.00%
Target B2 >=	51.80%	51.80%	52.00%	52.00%	52.50%	52.50%
Target C1 >=	64.60%	64.60%	65.00%	65.00%	65.50%	65.50%
Target C2 >=	68.30%	68.30%	68.50%	68.50%	69.00%	69.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

8,057

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	206	2.56%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,280	15.89%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	664	8.24%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,800	34.75%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,107	38.56%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,464	4,950	75.34%	75.30%	69.98%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were	5,907	8,057	69.76%	69.80%	73.32%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>							

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	244	3.03%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,989	24.69%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,020	12.66%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,856	35.45%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,948	24.18%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,876	6,109	60.19%	60.20%	63.45%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	4,804	8,057	51.80%	51.80%	59.63%	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	199	2.47%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,550	19.24%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	476	5.91%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,205	27.37%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3,627	45.02%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the	2,681	4,430	64.61%	64.60%	60.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	5,832	8,057	68.28%	68.30%	72.38%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	The primary reason for the slippage in the area of Personal Social Growth for Child Outcomes is reduced exposure to same-age peers during the pandemic. Due to precaution and illness, some students had a decrease in attendance or irregular attendance at school, reducing the social exposure to same-age peers.
C1	Slippage in the area of Adaptation Growth for Child Outcomes is due to reduced exposure to same-age peers during the pandemic. Due to precaution and illness, some students had a decrease in attendance or irregular attendance at school, reducing the exposure to self-help skills and typically developing peer models; there was a decrease in opportunity for growth.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

NO

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for A1, B1, and C1, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A2, B2, and C2 because the State's end targets for FFY 2025 do not reflect improvement over the State's FFY 2008 baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2025 targets for A2, B2, and C2 to reflect improvement.

7 - Required Actions

The State did not provide targets, for A2, B2, and C2 as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement Strategic Planning Team, which was formed and supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to parent involvement and engagement, including the percentage of parents who report that schools partnered with them. The team assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to improve results.

The Best Practices for Parent Involvement and Engagement Strategic Planning Team includes representatives from the bureau and from the following department areas and partner organizations:

- Florida Department of Education, Independent Education and Parental Choice
- Family Network on Disabilities- OSEP's federally funded parent center
- Florida Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS)
- Piedra Data Systems
- State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)
- Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach
- Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources Center (FDLRS)
- Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- University of Miami's Exceptional Student Education Parent Survey Project
- Parents of students with disabilities
- Parents of the Panhandle Information Network (POPIN) - Federally funded parent training and information center
- Parent Education Network- Federally funded parent training and information center

Bureau staff members and school district personnel all provided input, including staff from the following partner organizations, discretionary projects and advisory committees:

- The State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students
- State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee
- The Family Café
- Parent to Parent (of Miami) - Federally funded parent training and information center
- Florida Developmental Disability Council

Historical Data

Group	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Preschool	2008	Target >=	80.00%	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Preschool	43.00%	Data	73.02%	73.33%	73.33%	83.24%	82.43%
School age	2008	Target >=	80.00%	83.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
School age	32.00%	Data	77.05%	77.73%	77.74%	80.05%	81.64%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	82.60%	82.60%	82.70%	82.70%	82.80%	82.80%
Target B >=	81.60%	81.60%	82.00%	82.50%	82.60%	82.80%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

Group	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	3,773	4,517	82.43%	82.60%	83.53%	Met target	No Slippage
School age	34,028	41,972	81.64%	81.60%	81.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

403,944

Percentage of respondent parents

11.51%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	9.30%	11.51%

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

BEES will continue to provide a virtual and paper-based version of the survey. Districts are required to post these surveys on their websites, and many choose to share them via social media pages.

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.

Given the large percentage of respondents with missing data related to their child's race-ethnicity and primary exceptionality, this was not reported for K-12 students but was reported for Prekindergarten students. Based on an initial analysis of available data, students with disabilities identified as black had lower parent participation rates in the prekindergarten survey. The state will continue to offer paper based surveys in addition to the web-based survey to

assist in reducing bias. Additionally, this information will be relayed to the districts who may then focus their efforts towards increasing participation for parents representing under-participating groups.

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

Florida invites all parents of students receiving special education services to contribute their perceptions of schools’ efforts to promote their involvement. Florida has vastly increased the number of parents who have participated in the annual Indicator 8 survey. This year’s total of 46,489 respondents includes substantial representation of all racial/ethnic groups, grade levels, and categories of exceptionality. The state is actively involved in continuous improvement efforts to ensure that parent responses are representative of the demographics of the children receiving special education services to increase data available on the demographics of parents of K-12 students with disabilities.

Due to Florida’s diverse and mixed populations, the Florida Department of Education is committed to offering the opportunity for all parents and guardians to provide feedback to represent all diversities of our state’s students with disabilities. Each year during pre-survey planning, data containing the native language spoken in the student’s home is compiled. Surveys are then translated and provided to meet parent/student needs based on these demographics. Currently, the survey is available in English, Spanish, Haitian Creole, Russian, and Mandarin Chinese. Other languages are made available upon request. At the survey’s end, demographic data from all submitted surveys are analyzed to determine the extent to which the demographics of the submitted surveys compare to state demographic data specific to students receiving special education services as well as all students.

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

NO

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

Currently, the vendor the state contracts with to provide this information is not explicitly required to report these distributions and does not do so because of the large percentage of respondents with missing data related to their child’s race-ethnicity and primary exceptionality. To ensure that the response data are representative of those demographics, BEESS plans to include as a requirement in this contract that the vendor responsible for this data provide data on demographic questions so such data can be analyzed. Additionally, the bureau is developing processes to match student information for submitted surveys to demographic information available from the state’s data warehouse and is working on a data sharing agreement specific to this process to be able to better provide information on the representativeness of the demographic data for this indicator.

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

When at least 10% of the responses include information related to representativeness as part of their response, +/- 5% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group will be used to determine representativeness.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

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

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	75	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

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

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

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

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

1

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	75	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	92.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.05%	96.84%	97.81%	97.39%	95.43%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
55,571	54,259	95.43%	100%	97.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

1,312

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.

450 evaluations were conducted 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 257 evaluations were conducted 11-20 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 595 evaluations were conducted 21 or more days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 10 evaluations were not yet conducted and were pending at the time data was pulled.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
45	45	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that

each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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.

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that 45 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	32.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	99.90%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	7,901
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	244

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	6,622
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	549
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	486
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	6,622	6,622	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
0

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State monitoring

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	98.96%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.38%	94.84%	90.40%	95.64%	98.96%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
569	587	98.96%	100%	96.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

For FFY 2020, only one (1) of the State's 78 LEAs, had findings of noncompliance. During the State's monitoring window, the LEA had a change in Exceptional Student Education district-level leadership and required additional support and technical assistance with respect to the appropriate use and implementation of the postsecondary transition protocol.

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

State monitoring

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

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

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

If no, please explain

During the State's monitoring window related to SPP Indicator 13, section 1003.5716, Florida Statutes, required the following: To ensure quality planning for a successful transition of a student with a disability to postsecondary education and career opportunities, an IEP team shall begin the process of, and develop an IEP for, identifying the need for transition services before the student with a disability attains the age of 14 years in order for his or her postsecondary goals and career goals to be identified and in place when he or she attains the age of 16 years. The State's data collection procedures related to SPP Indicator 13, however, focuses on students whose IEPs are to be in effect when the students turn 16 in accordance with federal requirements. The State, pursuant to its general supervision obligation, may and does exercise monitoring activities to ensure LEAs are compliant with all State requirements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State provided support, training and technical assistance to assist the LEA to correctly implement the regulatory requirements. The LEA with noncompliance was required to submit corrective action plans and subsequent samples until they achieved a sample that demonstrated 100 percent compliance.

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

All 6 findings of non compliance for FFY 2019 came from a single LEA. The bureau, in collaboration with the Project 10 discretionary project, worked with this LEA to ensure all individual cases of non-compliance were corrected. This collaboration included regular check-ins and the provision of technical assistance and support. Supporting documentation was required by this LEA to be submitted to the bureau and was reviewed and found compliant by the state within one year.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

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

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State 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, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

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

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}}{\text{\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school}}\right]$ times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}}{\text{\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school}}\right]$ 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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}}{\text{\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school}}\right]$ times 100.

Instructions

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

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

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target >=	33.00%	35.00%	37.00%	39.00%	41.00%
A	27.00%	Data	28.48%	27.84%	24.30%	25.58%	24.71%
B	2009	Target >=	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%	53.00%
B	37.00%	Data	43.18%	43.84%	50.55%	55.03%	52.07%
C	2009	Target >=	60.00%	63.00%	66.00%	69.00%	72.00%
C	50.00%	Data	54.91%	56.16%	58.76%	62.97%	59.34%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	24.71%	25.00%	25.60%	26.00%	26.50%	26.50%
Target B >=	52.07%	52.07%	54.00%	55.10%	55.20%	55.20%
Target C >=	59.34%	59.34%	59.50%	59.50%	60.00%	60.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In addition to the stakeholder input described in the introduction, stakeholder input for this indicator was also received from the State Secondary Transition Interagency Committee (SSTIC) and the Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team, both of which were formed and are supported by the bureau. Input was received during face-to-face meetings and conference calls. Team members reviewed state- and district-level data related to transition indicators, including graduation rate, dropout rate, transition IEP compliance and postschool outcomes. It is important to note that the indicators graduation rate, dropout rate and postschool outcomes are also examined in combination to provide additional information on how the state, and each district, is performing. This collaborative process helps determine the level of support each district requires in Florida’s multi-tiered system of supporting school districts. The stakeholder groups assisted in the setting of targets, where appropriate, and the development of appropriate activities to

improve results in these areas.

In addition to parents of students with disabilities, self-advocates, members of bureau staff, and school district and postsecondary institution representatives, the members of SSTIC included representatives from the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Family Network on Disabilities
- Florida Alliance for Assistive Services and Technology (FAAST)
- Florida College System
- Florida Consortium on Postsecondary Education and Intellectual Disabilities
- Florida Center Students with Unique Abilities (FCSUA)
- Florida Department of Children and Families
- Florida Department of Education Bureau of Family and Community Outreach
- Florida Department of Education (FDOE) Division of Blind Services
- FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
- FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- FDOE Department of Education Office of Dropout Prevention
- Florida Department of Transportation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System (FDLRS)
- Florida Youth Council
- Institute for Small and Rural Districts
- Learning Disabilities Association of Florida
- Multiagency Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities (SEDNET)
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System
- The Able Trust

The Transition and Postsecondary Strategic Planning Team included representatives from the bureau and the following partner organizations:

- Agency for Persons with Disabilities
- Florida College System
- FDOE of Dropout Prevention
- FDOE Division of Career and Technical Education
- FDOE Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
- Florida Instructional Materials Center for the Visually Impaired (FIMC-VI)
- FDLRS
- Resource Materials and Technology Center: Deaf/Hard of Hearing (RMTC-DHH)
- SEDNET
- Project 10: Transition Education Network
- State University System

556 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 14 A. Of those 184 (33.09%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 30 (5.40%) responses indicated the targets were too low, and 342 (61.51%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

551 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 14 B. Of those 170 (30.85%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 24 (4.36%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 357 (64.79%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

551 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 14 C. Of those 159 (28.86%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 29 (5.26%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 363 (65.88%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	14,335
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	14,335
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	3,617
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	5,135
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)	342
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).	756

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	3,617	14,335	24.71%	24.71%	25.23%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	8,752	14,335	52.07%	52.07%	61.05%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	9,850	14,335	59.34%	59.34%	68.71%	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	2019	2020
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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 processes used by FETPIP rely on a technique referred to as "record linkage." This term describes a computerized process that combines individually identifiable data from several administrative databases. The purpose of the linkage is to develop aggregate statistics from the combinations that describe the experiences of student groups or participants after graduation or exiting an education or training program. The aggregates are used to produce outcome performance measures intended to assist in evaluating the success of educational programs.

FETPIP provides follow-up data collection services to a variety of agency applications. The individual information for follow-up is collected from the following sources: universities, community colleges, school districts, selected private vocational, schools, colleges, and universities, welfare transition services, corrections system, farm Worker Jobs and Education programs, and specialized and longitudinal studies. All identifiable data are protected from public disclosure, as specified in the Buckley Amendments and Florida Statutes. The individual information is compiled into computer files and tapes distributed to agencies with administrative records that meet the purposes of the follow-up exercise. The records are electronically linked with the: Florida Department of Education, Florida Department of Corrections, Florida Department of Children and Families, Florida Department of Economic Opportunity

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.

FETPIP data provides accountability and outcome information for consumers and career information for students and counselors. One of the benefits of having the FETPIP system is that data are collected that can help facilitate comparisons. A sample is listed below:

- Employment and/or education outcomes of a training program can be compared to others.
- Employment results can be examined regarding the training programs that feed them.
- Program outcomes can be compared by race, sex, age, or income level.
- Earnings can be compared across various education levels
- The level of public assistance can be compared between graduates, dropouts, and others

Several organizations have requested that FETPIP staff assist them with staged follow-up processes that batch program participants/students who terminated programs in a selected period and follows-up for employment data after the passage of a predetermined amount of time.

FETPIP conducts quarterly, staged follow-ups using unemployment compensation wage records for all workforce development program participants. Initially, through a state law - The Workforce Florida Act of 1996 - Florida has established a consistent set of core performance measures for all workforce education and training program areas. These data are collected through the FETPIP quarterly match process and supplemented through the annual comprehensive effort.

FETPIP works with Florida's major welfare reform initiatives to conduct staged follow-ups on participants during and after their involvement in the program. The objective is to monitor the reduction in welfare that occurs as participants become increasingly employable. The quarterly process is also used to support Temporary Assistance to Needy Families High-Performance Bonus awards.

Increasingly, FETPIP data continue to be an integral part of the performance measures used by Florida's public schools, vocational institutions, community colleges, universities, and the workforce development system.

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

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

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).

FETPIP's method of data collection replaces conventional survey-type techniques and provides information in an accurate and cost-effective manner. The follow-up studies are conducted annually by matching records of the student graduates, completers or exiters from the numerous public and independent organizations with information resources available to FETPIP. Follow-up on a quarterly basis is also done for some groups.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for sub-indicators 14B and 14C, but OSEP cannot accept the target for 14A because the State's end target for FFY 2025 does not reflect improvement over the State's FFY 2009 baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2025 end target for 14A to reflect improvement.

14 - Required Actions

The State did not provide targets, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	129
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	102

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

534 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 15. Of those 100 (18.73%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 22 (18.73%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 412 (77.15%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	57.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	73.00%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%	75.50%
Data	79.66%	29.63%	97.22%	92.59%	61.83%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	79.07%	79.07%	79.50%	79.50%	80.00%	80.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
102	129	61.83%	79.07%	79.07%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	31
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	25

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

529 individuals responded to the survey regarding Indicator 16. Of those 53 (10.02%) responses indicated the targets were too low, 39 (7.37%) responses indicated the targets were too high, and 437 (82.61%) responses indicated the targets were appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	79.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	70.20%	72.20%	74.20%	75.00%	75.50%
Data	60.53%	66.67%	72.00%	69.05%	79.49%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	80.65%	83.33%	83.50%	83.50%	84.00%	84.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	25	31	79.49%	80.65%	80.65%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE), in collaboration with its internal and external stakeholders, chose the State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) of increasing the statewide cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities from 77% (2017-18 graduates) to 83% (2025-26 graduates) and closing the graduation gap between all students (baseline 10.2 percentage points in 2017-18) and students with disabilities by half (=5.1 percentage points). The State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is related to the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) results Indicator #1: Percentage of youth with individual educational plans graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. §1416(b))

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

NO

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

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The state uses a cohort model for this indicator.

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.

<https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7672/urlt/Theoryofaction.pdf>

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

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The data collected through the desktop monitoring for performance and the student outcome data serve as the SEA's method of evaluating and monitoring the fidelity of implementation and assessment of practice change. Progress is also monitored by both the BEESS strategic planning teams associated with the specific work the district is doing and the bureau's discretionary projects, who report their activities in the Project Tracking System, an online database. According to the data, there has also been an increase in student outcomes. The cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities was 82.3% in 2020-21, which is 5.3 percentage points over the baseline data from 2017-18 and meets the target. The graduation gap in 2020-21 was 8.9 percentage points, which exceeds the SiMR target of a decrease in the gap of at least 8.0 percentage points by 2025-26.

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
2020	82.32%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target> =	82.30%	82.35%	82.50%	82.50%	83.00%	83.50%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of students with disabilities (SWDs) who graduated with their federal cohort	Total number of SWDs in the graduation cohort	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
20,851	25,328		82.30%	82.32%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

Florida Department of Education, Final Survey 5 Cohort graduation data.

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

The Department of Education (DOE) conducts surveys of school district student and staff information at scheduled survey times during the reporting year. Survey 5 is used to collect end-of-year information and secondary career and technical education and industry certification information. More information about the state's survey collection process can be found at the following link: <https://www.fldoe.org/accountability/data-sys/database-manuals-updates/user-manual.shtml>.

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

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

In 2021, the SEA collected input from the State Advisory Panel (SAP) and other stakeholder groups to restructure the LEA survey to evaluate the level of application of the What Matters Most: Six Key Practices. Based on stakeholder input, the SEA restructured the LEA survey to include questions gauging the implementation at the district, school, and parent/family level. The survey response scale was also revised to reflect a more research aligned rating scale with 1 = Never (Inadequate Application), 2 = Rarely (Less than Average Application and in need of additional support/practice), 3 = Sometimes (Average Application), 4 = Often (Acceptable Application), and 5= Always (Consistent Application). Based on themes collected through LEA on-site visits, the survey required LEAs to identify specific barriers to the application of each of the Six Key Practices. The identification of statistically significant barriers that impede the implementation of the Six Key Practices will assist in identifying needs that should be addressed by the LEA with the support of the SEA.

The state also uses a measure of the gap in graduation rates with a standard diploma by subtracting the federal cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities from the federal cohort graduation rate for all students. For 2020, the cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities was 82.30%. For 2020, the federal cohort graduation rate for all students was 90.10%. Using these numbers, the gap measure calculated was 7.8% (90.10% - 82.30%). Our 2020-2021 targets for this gap measure are below:

- FFY 2020: 7.8%
- FFY 2021: 7.8%
- FFY 2022: 7.5%
- FFY 2023: 7.5%
- FFY 2024: 7.1%
- FFY 2025: 7.1%

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)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

While Florida's cohort high school graduation rate for SWD was 82.3 percent in 2020-21, it is essential to remember that according to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-2, for students expected to graduate in the spring of 2021, school districts were authorized to waive the required state assessments for graduation as stipulated in s. 1003.4282, F.S. It is possible that some of these students may not have ended up meeting the assessment graduation requirements if those had been entirely in effect. Therefore, one cannot conclude that these students would have graduated if not provided the exemption. This uncertainty highlights the challenges in interpreting these results, as it did last year.

In response to the national emergency, the state quickly supported our seniors' last school year. To mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection in the years to come, the SEA will continue our statewide partnership with LEAs to support their continued progress monitoring and interventions to struggling learners. The accurate measurement of our collective efforts will be how we helped our students grow and overcome adversity during this pandemic.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

<https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7734/urlt/2025ListMeasures.pdf>

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:

The SEA and stakeholders have reviewed the Theory of Action and determined no changes were required. The State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) and the primary evidence-based practice have also not changed since the inception of the SSIP). However, the process has been enhanced each year from lessons learned in the previous year. A major example is that the most critical tier three intervention, the on-site monitoring, and assistance

visit, is a richer experience for both the LEA and the SEA. Additional stakeholders have been included in the visits from both SEA and LEA teams. The participation level of LEA general education staff and leaders in the on-site visits is now routine and expected. Executive leaders, including LEA superintendents, participated in all of the on-site visits, as did other district-level staff and building leaders, including the principals of the individual schools visited. The SEA added more members from general education to the on-site visit teams, including FDOE senior staff from the Bureau of School Improvement and other SEA senior leadership staff.

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.

As found by both self-assessment survey data and as seen during on-site visits to districts, the evaluation of implementation has revealed progress toward all measures and outcomes. According to the survey results, there has been increased use of the Six Key Practices by the SEA and the LEAs to lead continuous improvement efforts. There has also been an increase in student outcomes. The cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities was 82.3% in 2020-21, which is 5.3 percentage points over the baseline data from 2017-18 and meets the target. The cohort graduation gap in 2020-21 was 7.8 percentage points, which exceeds the SIMR target of a decrease in the gap of at least 8.0 percentage points by 2025-26.

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.

Six Key Practices:

Beginning in 2012, the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services engaged stakeholders in conversation in order to review key evidence-based practices for systems improvement for state, districts and schools from What Matters Most: Moving Your Numbers (NCEO, 2012). Since that time the key practices have guided the relationships between SEA, LEA and other stakeholders towards continuous improvement of the State Performance Plans for Students with Disabilities.

1. Use Data Well-FDOE will Identify and respond to community needs, and create, refine and revise state systems of support.

Anticipated outcome- Each LEA will establish clear expectations for data use. Use data to identify needs, measure implementation and impact on student learning and revise procedures.

2. Focus Goals- FDOE will establish common goals, provide products and services to facilitate focused goal setting and coherent plans

Anticipated Outcome- Each LEA will establish priority on improving teaching and learning, ensure alignment of goals, take leadership responsibility for goal setting

3. Select & Implement Shared Instructional Practices- FDOE will serve to help districts improve the quality of instruction to all students, establish a statewide system of support to districts

Anticipated Outcome- Each LEA will align standards-based instruction to district goals build common language understanding, require ongoing progress monitoring

4. Implement Deeply- FDOE will limit state and district requirements provide products and services that help districts fully implement strategies

Anticipated Outcome- Each LEA will ensure consistent implementation of selected improvement strategies, require aligned school structures, and provide support and accountability

5. Monitor & Provide Feedback- FDOE will help districts understand relationship between monitoring for improvement and monitoring for compliance

Anticipated Outcome- Each LEA will use district identified formative indicators for implementation, provide differentiated support and consistently measure effectiveness

6. Inquire & Learn-FDOE will evaluate adult and student learning, recognize continuous improvement of all students and specific groups of students

Anticipated Outcome- Each LEA will pursue continuous improvement, establish a decision-making process, and provide active oversight of instruction

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

In determining improvement strategies based on an implementation framework that will lead to and support systemic change for the state, the bureau has implemented evidence based practices to support this work to include:

Best Practices for Appropriate Evaluation and Identification

1. Increase equitable outcomes and close the achievement gap by reducing inappropriate identification of black students as disabled.

2. Monitor state and district disproportionality patterns and trends.

3. Calculate district and state risk ratios data based on October Survey 2.

a. Review district data and identify districts with disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

b. Review and modify procedures for determining and monitoring disproportionality.

c. Evaluate and modify, as needed, formulas for determining disproportionality and inappropriate identification (e.g., "n" size; cut-off criteria)

d. Provide technical assistance and support on calculating risk ratios and using risk data to monitor disproportionate placement

e. Disaggregate EBD data by ethnicity and gender

4. Provide technical assistance on improving the effectiveness of the problem-solving and multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) to reduce the need to label students as disabled.

5. Provide technical assistance on practical problem solving and tiered supports to selected districts

6. Collaborate with Inclusion, Positive Behavior/Student Engagement, Parent Involvement, and Pre-K workgroups to address systemic issues in disproportionality.

7. Coordinate intensive support with other performance indicators on on-site visits

8. Integrate support for targeted districts with disproportionality in discipline with Best Practices in Positive Behavior/Student Engagement

9. Identify evidence-based trainings that districts can implement

Best Practices for Inclusion

1. Facilitate targeted problem solving and action planning with districts to improve inclusion and LRE rates.

2. Measure districts' progress on the percentage of students with disabilities educated in the LRE and identify factors contributing to its increase.

Best Practices for Positive Behavior/Student Engagement

1. Through collaboration with BEESS, discretionary projects, and districts, provide data, technical assistance, practical problem solving, professional development, and tiered supports to increase student engagement and reduce the need for restraint, seclusion, suspension, and expulsion. Hence,

students remain in class/school and successfully master Florida Standards.

2. Collect, compile and analyze district and state restraint, seclusion, suspension, and expulsion data to inform decision making and district determinations.
3. Provide professional development opportunities related to issues of cultural diversity.
4. Collaborate with dispute resolution and monitoring to identify best practices and districts in need of assistance and collect additional information and data related to SP&Ps.

Best Practices for Transition/Postsecondary

1. Review and analyze current, trend, and disaggregated data related to graduation rate and arrange districts in tiers based on performance. Identify districts for intensive training, technical assistance, and support, and assist those districts in developing, implementing, and evaluating an action plan focused on increasing the graduation rate using the eight-step problem-solving process.
2. Review and analyze current, trend, and disaggregated data related to drop-out rate and arrange districts in tiers based on performance. Identify districts for intensive training, technical assistance, and support, and assist those districts in developing, implementing, and evaluating an action plan focused on decreasing the drop-out rate using the eight-step problem-solving process.
3. Evaluate data on district performance related to IEP non-compliance and arrange districts in tiers based on performance
4. Provide tiered support in the form of professional development activities and technical assistance on evidence-based practices to school districts. Identify areas of need and develop a schedule of professional development activities designed to impact Indicator 13 outcomes (e.g., participation in PDA-ESE Transition Module, transition assessment training, secondary transition, and compliance training).
5. Increase the percentage of standard diploma graduates (SWDs) who enroll in college for AA, AS, AAS, or in state and private universities.
6. Examine postsecondary program data, including students with disabilities by program, etc.
7. Increase participation of students with disabilities in dual enrollment and other accelerated programs.
8. Increase the percentage of students who continue education at the postsecondary level.
9. Review and analyze current, trend, and disaggregated data related to post-school outcomes and arrange districts in tiers based on performance.
10. Provide tiered support in the form of professional development activities and technical assistance on evidence-based practices, including those detailed below, to school districts.
11. Collaborate with national and state partners to identify and plan support for student development activities.
12. Identify districts for intensive training, technical assistance, and support, and assist those districts in developing, implementing, and evaluating an action plan focused on improving post-school outcomes using the eight-step problem-solving process.
13. Collaborate with other agencies and interagency committees to encourage employers to hire individuals with disabilities.
14. Increase the percentage of students with disabilities who earn at least one industry certification.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

In addition to the Six Key Practices for systems change, the SEA has offered additional evidence based practices or EBPs geared toward supporting schools with efforts to improve student achievement and therefore increase graduation. For example, the SEA encourages all LEAs to use an Early Warning Systems (EWS). The SEA, through Project 10: Transition Education Network, a project focused on secondary transition and supported by discretionary funds, offers training and technical assistance in a Florida-developed EWS that involves using school-level data, such as grade-point average, credits earned, attendance, behavior and other data elements, to sort students into levels based on their risk of not graduating on time. The project also offers training and technical assistance on evidence-based interventions designed to help students after they have been identified as being at-risk. After categorizing the needs of students, the schools implement an MTSS, providing individual students with the appropriate level of support and services needed to ensure that each one graduates. Currently, 73 out of 79 (92.4%) of LEAs use an EWS, including 66 of the 67 (98.5%) of traditional LEAs (those that are Florida counties). In addition to training and technical assistance provided by Project 10, the online course "Using an Early Warning System to Increase Graduation Success" on the Personnel Development Alternatives Portal guides LEA personnel through the process. Some LEAs are using the system for students in both general and exceptional education and the system has been automated to work within various district information technology systems.

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.

In addition to the Six Key Practices for systems change, the SEA has offered additional EBPs geared toward supporting schools to improve student achievement and therefore increase graduation. For example, the SEA encourages all LEAs to use an Early Warning Systems (EWS).

The SEA, through Project 10: Transition Education Network, a project focused on secondary transition and supported by discretionary funds, offers training and technical assistance in a Florida-developed EWS that involves using school-level data, such as grade-point average, credits earned, attendance, behavior, and other data elements, to sort students into levels based on their risk of not graduating on time. The project also offers training and technical assistance on evidence-based interventions designed to help students after being identified as at-risk. After categorizing the needs of students, the schools implement an MTSS, providing individual students with the appropriate level of support and services needed to ensure that each one graduates. Currently, 73 out of 79 (92.4%) of LEAs use an EWS, including 66 of the 67 (98.5%) of traditional LEAs (those that are Florida counties).

In addition to training and technical assistance provided by Project 10, the online course "Using an Early Warning System to Increase Graduation Success" on the Personnel Development Alternatives Portal guides LEA personnel through the process. Some LEAs are using the system for general and exceptional education students, and the system has been automated to work within various district information technology systems.

Florida's original decision to choose a statewide increase in graduation rate for all students with disabilities as the SIMR, rather than concentrate on specific LEAs or specific sub-groups of students with disabilities, was both deliberate and strategic. Scalability is always a concern when improvement strategies are initially focused on a sub-set of the population. By choosing the entire state rate as the target for improvement and instituting a systemic framework, the Six Key Practices, rather than narrowly focused evidence-based practices, Florida avoided issues with scaling up systemic improvement efforts. Also assisting in the effort was consistency in state-level personnel. The use of an MTSS to provide differing levels of support to LEAs, based on their performance and needs, allows the state to address the needs of all LEAs in a targeted and intentional manner. Universal supports, including general, statewide support designed to inform, assist, and improve results for all districts, were provided to all LEAs. More focused and frequent supports, in addition to and aligned with existing universal supports, are provided to subgroups of LEAs in response to identified needs. The support provided to LEAs is also continuous. The SEA recognizes that LEA staff turnover creates the need for constant training and technical assistance. The discretionary projects' staff work at the district and school level to provide continuous services to exceptional education staff, general educators, and others in the LEA, such as the management information systems (MIS) team.

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

The most important measures are student outcomes, specifically the cohort graduation rates, the graduation gap, and the dropout rates of students with disabilities. Desktop monitoring for performance also models key practices of implementing deeply and monitoring and providing feedback and support. The data collected through the desktop monitoring for performance and the student outcome data serve as the S.E.A.s method of evaluating and monitoring the fidelity of implementation and assessment of practice change. Data collected through the L.E.A. survey indicated an increase in implementing the Six Key Practices. The data provided areas that S.E.A. support is needed to mitigate L.E.A. barriers to the consistent application of the key practices. Progress is also monitored by both the BEESS strategic planning teams associated with the specific work the district is doing and the discretionary projects, who report their activities in the Project Tracking System, an online database. Section 1003.57(1)(b)1., Florida Statutes (F.S.) requires that district school boards submit to the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) proposed procedures for providing special instruction and services for exceptional students once every three years. Approval of this document by FDOE is required by Rule 6A-6.03411, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). The E.S.E. Policies and Procedures (SP&P) Monitoring is an additional mechanism for evaluating and monitoring fidelity and practice change.

Data collected through the L.E.A. survey indicated an increase in implementing the Six Key Practices. The data provided areas where support is needed to mitigate L.E.A. barriers to a consistent application of the key practices. Progress is also monitored by both the BEESS strategic planning teams associated with the specific work the district is doing and the discretionary projects, who report their activities in the Project Tracking System, an online database. Section 1003.57(1)(b)1., Florida Statutes (F.S.) requires that district school boards submit to the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) proposed procedures for the provision of special instruction and services for exceptional students once every three years. Approval of this document by FDOE is required by Rule 6A-6.03411, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). The E.S.E. Policies and Procedures (SP&P) Monitoring is an additional mechanism for evaluating and monitoring fidelity and practice change.

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.

Florida's original decision to choose a statewide increase in the cohort graduation rate for all students with disabilities as the SIMR, rather than concentrate on specific LEAs or specific sub-groups of students with disabilities, was both deliberate and strategic. Scalability is always a concern when improvement strategies are initially focused on a sub-set of the population. By choosing the entire state rate as the target for improvement and instituting a systemic framework, the Six Key Practices, rather than a narrowly focused evidence-based practice, Florida avoided issues with scaling up systemic improvement efforts. Also assisting in the effort was consistency in state-level personnel. The use of an MTSS to provide differing levels of support to LEAs, based on their performance and needs, allows the state to address the needs of all LEAs in a targeted and intentional manner. Universal supports, including general, statewide support designed to inform, assist, and improve results for all districts, were provided to all LEAs. More focused and frequent supports, in addition to and aligned with existing universal supports, are provided to subgroups of LEAs in response to identified needs. The support provided to LEAs is also continuous. The SEA recognizes that LEA staff turnover creates the need for constant training and technical assistance. The discretionary projects' staff work at the district and school level to provide continuous services to exceptional education staff, general educators, and others in the LEA, such as management information systems (MIS) staff.

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

BEESS will continue to use the Six Key Practices to support positive educational outcomes for students with disabilities. though the following:

1. Implementation of high-quality standards and assessments
2. Improvement of educator effectiveness
3. Incentivizing institutions to provide opportunities
4. Improvement of accountability systems that promote institution improvements
5. Improved effectiveness of and opportunity for career preparation
6. Promote high-quality educational choice
7. Strengthen stakeholder communication and partnerships
8. Increased quality and efficiency of services

These strategies will allow FDOE/ BEESS to provide:

1. Highest student achievement, as indicated by evidence of student learning gains at all levels.
2. Seamless articulation and maximum access, as measured by evidence of progression, readiness, and access by targeted groups of students identified by the Commissioner of Education.
3. Skilled workforce and economic development, as measured by evidence of employment and earnings.
4. Quality efficient services, as measured by evidence of return on investment.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Two thousand seven hundred thirty responses were collected from stakeholders regarding the graduation targets for students with disabilities. The results were as follows.

9.83% (170) of the stakeholders found the proposed targets too high

23.58% (408) of the stakeholders found the proposed targets too low

66.59% (1,152) of the stakeholders found the proposed targets appropriate.

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

Florida recognizes that stakeholder input is vital to develop and maintain successful educational programs. Multiple internal and external stakeholders are involved in identifying SSIP improvement strategies necessary to ensure that all students with disabilities graduate from high school with a standard diploma and college, career and life ready. The FDOE collaborates with stakeholders, including parents, students, educators and administrators from districts, state agencies, advocacy groups, institutions of higher education, discretionary projects, federally funded parent support groups. Many of these same stakeholders are also represented on the State Advisory Committee. Stakeholders participate in data analysis, provide feedback on areas of concern regarding the performance of students with disabilities and assist in identifying the root causes of low performance. They also provide information about the overall strengths and weaknesses of the state's infrastructure. The SAC meets twice each year and a substantial portion of each two-day meeting includes reviewing and providing input on the SEA's strategic plan and the SSIP, including the evaluation components. In late 2020, in addition to reviewing progress made toward the SIMR and providing feedback and input to the strategic planning team leaders, the SAC also provided specific input on the new graduation targets for students with disabilities that will be set for 2020-2021 and beyond. Stakeholder input is also gathered via strategic planning teams that are responsible for the development and implementation of the strategic plan. This five-year plan lists the specific actions and activities that must be completed in order to achieve the targets noted in the State Performance Plan. The plan also provides a venue to

record progress made toward completing the actions and activities. All of the activities of the bureau are aimed at raising the graduation rate of students with disabilities.

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

NO

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The state will continue to accept feedback from stakeholders and address concerns strategically through the problem-solving process. At this time, there are no concerns that BEESS must address,

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.

BEESS, in partnership with its discretionary project focused on transition for students with disabilities, Project 10, and in alignment with state specific legislative changes, will perform a state level review of transition supports specific to students with disabilities and identify promising practices to disseminate to LEAs and use in trainings. The bureau will also lead efforts to implement state required transition components to the individual educational plans of students with disabilities at an earlier age and perform desktop monitoring to identify additional training and activities needed for LEAs.

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

Currently data collection, desktop monitoring and a review of district current practices is ongoing. By July 1, 2022 initial results will be reviewed and a first draft of results, including the identification of districts with promising practices, will be produced and begin review. The report will be disseminated to districts by January 2023 and targeted training to include these results will begin that spring and continue. Project 10 will continue an annual survey of district practices and data for the next five years for this purpose.

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

FDOE has not identified barriers at this time.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

No additional information is available for this indicator at this time.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the State did not provide an explanation for that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, however OSEP cannot accept the State's FFYs 2020-2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the State's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the State's baseline data, given that the State's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above.

The State provided a cohort gap measure (7.8%) and a second set of FFY 2020-2025 targets in its "additional data" narrative. OSEP can not determine whether the State intends the cohort gap measure to be a second State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).

17 - Required Actions

The State did not provide an explanation for revising the baseline using data from FFY 2020. If the State uses data from FFY 2020 as the baseline, the State must provide an explanation for that revision in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State did not provide targets, as required by the measurement table. The State must provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

The State provided data for a cohort graduation gap measure in its narrative. If these data are intended to be a second State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR), the State must report the data, and related targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR. Specifically, these data and targets must be included in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR target and data tables.

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Victoria Gaitanis

Title:

Bureau Chief, Exceptional Education and Student Services

Email:

victoria.gaitanis@fldoe.org

Phone:

850-245-0941

Submitted on:

04/28/22 4:50:00 PM